WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

OECD

AIDFORTRADE AT A GLANCE 2019

ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND EMPOWERMENT



AIDFORTRADE AT A GLANCE 2019

ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND EMPOWERMENT



WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION



The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of the OECD member countries or of the World Trade Organization or its members.

This document, as well as any data and map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

Please cite this publication as:
OECD/WTO (2019), *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2019: Economic Diversification and Empowerment*, OECD Publishing, Paris, *https://doi.org/10.1787/18ea27d8-en*.

ISBN 978-92-64-40293-5 (print)
ISBN 978-92-64-42951-2 (pdf)

Aid for Trade at a Glance
ISSN 2223-4403 (print)
ISSN 2223-4411 (online)

WTO:
ISBN 978-92-870-4986-5 (print)
ISBN 978-92-870-4989-6 (e-book/PDF format)

Revised version, September 2019
Details of revisions available at: *http://www.oecd.org/about/publishing/Corrigendum_Aid_for_Trade_2019.pdf*

Corrigenda to publications may be found on line at: *www.oecd.org/about/publishing/corrigenda.htm*.

© OECD and WTO 2019

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the Terms and Conditions to be found at *http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions*.

FOREWORD

Economic diversification and empowerment are essential for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Both objectives also embody the rationale behind the Aid for Trade Initiative. Economic diversification offers a pathway for empowerment, while empowement allows women, youth and micro, small and medium sized enterprises to engage in trade. Growth in agriculture, manufacture and services offers entrepreneurial opportunities and generates productive jobs. In turn, this economic diversification contributes to rising incomes and human development more generally. We have seen this pattern of progress in many developing countries bringing substantive reductions in extreme poverty.

However, the pace of economic diversification is uneven and the pattern evolving, while some economies face inherent challenges. This is especially true for small, island, landlocked or resource dependent countries and those that are affected by fragility and conflict. At the same time, rapid technological progress threatens to disrupt established pathways for economic development, but also offers new growth and development opportunities. Elevated environmental risks require new approaches to economic diversification.

International trade can help. An open, rules based trading system contributes to global welfare. It helps diffuse goods and services, and also the technology and knowledge to manage environmental challenges. But turning trade opportunities into trade flows, requires us to redouble our efforts to tackle the numerous supply side constraints that many developing countries are still facing, particularly the least-developed countries.


Much is already happening. Since the Aid for Trade Initative started in 2006, USD 409 billion in official development assistance and USD 346 billion in low concessional loans has been disbursed to help developing countries build their trade capacities. Almost another USD 100 billion in both flows combined is committed in 2017. In addition, South-South providers contributed USD 9 billion and foundation USD 100 million.

The At a Glance report illustrates many examples of how this support helps developing countries improve their competitiveness, expand and diversify their trade, attract foreign direct investment, and create employment for men and women. Improvements in trade facilitation are a case in point. It highlights that support aligned around national priorities works best and contributes to an environment in which business can prosper, in particular the micro, small and medium sized enterprises that are the backbone of most developing economies. This report also highlights the scale of the challenge still ahead.

We need to learn from these examples to reinforce the coherence between aid and trade that is required to address the challenges and opportunities of economic diversification and empowerment. Most of all we need to consider that the economic empowerment of youth and women is not the outcome of the process of economic diversification, but frequently the starting point.



Angel Gurría
Secretary-General,
OECD




Roberto Azevêdo
Director-General,
WTO

AID FOR TRADE FACTS AND FIGURES

FINANCING FLOWS

Aid for Trade disbursements



US$ 410 billion
disbursed from 2006 to 2017

US$ 154.9 billion to Asia

US$ 146.2 billion to Africa

US$ 12.2 per capita in least-developed countries (LDCs) in 2017

US$ 4.7 per capita in non-LDCs in 2017

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System Database

PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES


Aid for Trade projects since 2006

A total of **178,141** Aid for Trade projects have been funded since 2006.


The median project size is **US$ 98,400.**

The average project size is **US$ 2.25 million.**

Number of projects per region




Aid for Trade disbursements, by type



Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System Database

TRADE OUTCOMES


Export diversification



Source: WTO Database

Progress in economic and export diversification is not uniform nor universal. According to the OECD-WTO Monitoring and Evaluation Exercise 2019, 53 per cent of developing countries reported **progress in economic diversification** since the launch of the Aid for Trade initiative in 2006 – 66 per cent for LDCs. Services is the sector with the second-most progress after agriculture, as reported by 33 per cent of developing countries.


Sectors where respondents reported most progress



Source: OECD-WTO Monitoring and Evaluation Exercise 2019

IMPACTS

Ninety per cent of developing country respondents recognized **economic empowerment as a priority** in their national or regional development strategy – 95 per cent for LDCs and landlocked developing countries (LLDCs).



Source: World Bank – World Development Indicators, United Nations Development Programme - International Human Development Indicators

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Aid for Trade at a Glance: Economic Diversification and Empowerment was prepared under the aegis of the OECD Development Assistance Committee and Trade Committee together with the WTO Committee on Trade and Development. The OECD and WTO Secretariats would like to express their appreciation to all the governments, intergovernmental organisations, nongovernmental organisations that participated in the 2019 aid-for-trade monitoring and evaluation exercise.

The report has been prepared under the overall guidance of Frans Lammersen (OECD) and Michael Roberts (WTO). Managerial support was provided by Jorge Moreira da Silva, Ken Ash (OECD) and Shishir Priyadarshi (WTO).

Chapter 1 was written by Justine Lan, Michael Roberts and Dayong Yu (WTO); Chapter 2 by Frans Lammersen (OECD); Chapter 3 by Nobuya Haraguchi (UNIDO); Chapter 4 by Luisa Bernal (UNDP) and Daria Shatskova (EIF); Chapter 5 by Paul Brenton, Ian Gillson and Pierre Sauvé (WBG); Chapter 6 by William John Gain, Brian O'Shea and Heidi Stensland (WBG), Evdokia Moïsé (OECD) and Pamela Ugaz (UNCTAD); Chapter 7 by Miho Shirotori and Cecilia Heuser (UNCTAD); Chapter 8 by Sarah Mohan and Valentina Rollo (ITC); and Chapter 9 by Kaori Miyamoto and Marianne Musumeci (OECD). The country profiles were prepared by Rainer Lanz (WTO)

The aid-for-trade monitoring and evaluation exercise was conducted by Théo Mbise and Justine Lan. Statistical support was provided by Aussama Bejraoui (OECD). The report was designed by Peggy King Cointepas. The team was assisted by Najat Lachal (OECD).

In addition, the following persons are acknowledged: Néstor Pelechà Aigües, Mark Baldock, Juan Casado Asensio, Freerk Boedeltje, Stacey Bradbury, Ana Fernandes, Tomas Hos, James Kim, Anne-Lise Prigent, Jan-Anno Schuur, Annelise Thim, Thierry Vebr (all OECD); David Cordobés, Eleonora de Falcis, Jennifer Freedman, Marion Jansen, Evelyn Seltier, Jasmeer Virdee, Matthew Wilson (all ITC), Ratnakar Adhikari (EIF); Riad Meddeb (UNDP), Pamela Coke-Hamilton, Poul Hansen, Jan Hoffmann, Brook Kidane, Samuel Munyaneza, Alessandro Nicita, Bonapas Onguglo, Ralf Peters, Mesut Saygili (all UNCTAD) Barbara Marcetich (WTO)

Generous financial support for this work from the government of the Netherlands and from the government of Sweden for analysis underpinning Chapter 9 is gratefully acknowledged. ■

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD 3

AID FOR TRADE FACTS AND FIGURES 4

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 7

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS 21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 25

CHAPTER 1 SETTING THE SCENE 25

Contributed by World Trade Organisation

Introduction 28

Economic diversification as a policy priority 30

Export diversification: progress and constraints 34

Economic empowerment 42

Conclusions 49

CHAPTER 2 AID FOR TRADE, ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND EMPOWERMENT 51

Contributed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Overview 52

Financing sustainable development 53

Aid for trade disbursements since 2006 57

Is aid for trade working? 60

Empowerment through economic diversification 63

Building trade related infrastructure 70

Support in 2017 74

CHAPTER 3 PROMOTING ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION THROUGH INDUSTRIALISATION 81

Contributed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

Introduction 82

Industrialisation for economic diversification and structural transformation 83

Conclusions 103

New opportunities and challenges arise from digitalisation and digital trade 95

Information flows enable the trade logistics chain 101

Conclusions 105

CHAPTER 4 AID FOR TRADE IN CHALLENGING CONTEXTS 109

Contributed by the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)1

Introduction 110
The imperative of economic diversification in the LDCs 111
Aid for trade to support economic diversification in the LDCs 120
Conclusions 126
Annex 131

CHAPTER 5 ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION: LESSONS FROM PRACTICE 135

Contributed by the World Bank Group

Why economic diversification matters 136
The policy and institutional framework for diversification 143
The imperative of reduced trade costs 150
Policies to support adjustment 155
Final thoughts 156

CHAPTER 6 THE CRITICAL ROLE OF TRADE FACILITATION IN SUPPORTING ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND STRUCTURAL REFORMS 161

Contributed by the World Bank, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Introduction 162
Technical and Capacity Building Support and its impacts 162
Facilitation of e-commerce trade 181
Conclusion 189

CHAPTER 7 EXPORT DIVERSIFICATION AT THE TIME OF SLOWBALISATION 195

Contributed by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

Export diversification strategies – then and now 196
Services trade and South-South interregional trade 199
South-South regional regulatory cooperation 205
The role of aid for trade 206

CHAPTER 8 EMPOWERING YOUTH FOR SUSTAINABLE TRADE 213

Contributed by the International Trade Centre

Introduction 214
Youth skills for export ready companies 214
Promoting self-employment and entrepreneurship 220
Governments can stimulate youth empowerment 228
Conclusions and recommendations 234

CHAPTER 9 EMERGING LESSONS FROM AID FOR TRADE IN SUPPORT OF WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT 243

Contributed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Context 242

Assessing incorporation of gender perspectives in aid for trade 244

Strategies and guidelines in Incorporating gender perspectives in aid for trade 253

Summary and conclusions 263

COUNTRY PROFILES 373
Explanatory notes 275
Afghanistan 282
Albania 284
Angola 286
Antigua and Barbuda 288
Bangladesh 290
Barbados 292
Belize 294
Benin 296
Bhutan 298
Brunei Darussalam 300
Burkina Faso 302
Burundi 304
Cambodia 306
Cape Verde 308
Central African Republic 310
Chad 312
Colombia 314
Comoros 316
Democratic Republic of Congo 318
Costa Rica 320
Côte d'Ivoire 322
Dominican Republic 324
Ecuador 326
El Salvador 328
Equatorial Guinea 330
Ethiopia 332
Gabon 334
Gambia 336
Georgia 338
Grenada 340
Guatemala 342
Guinea 344
Guinea-Bissau 346
Honduras 348
Indonesia 350
Iraq 352
Kazakhstan 354
Kenya 356
Kiribati 358
Kyrgyz Republic 360
Lao People's Democratic Republic 362
Lesotho 364
Liberia 366
Madagascar 368
Malawi 370
Maldives 372
Mali 374
Mauritania 376
Mauritius 378
Mexico 380
Mongolia 382
Myanmar 384
Nepal 386
Niger 388
Nigeria 390
Lesotho 392
Palau 394
Panama 396
Papua New Guinea 398
Paraguay 400
Peru 402
Philippines 404
Saint Kitts and Nevis 406
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines 408
Samoa 410
São Tomé and Príncipe 412
Senegal 414
Seychelles 416
Solomon Islands 418
Sri Lanka 420
Sudan 422
Tajikistan 424
Tanzania 426
Thailand 428
Togo 430
Tonga 432
Tuvalu 434
Uganda 436
Ukraine 438
Uzbekistan 440
Vanuatu 442
Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela 444
Viet Nam 446
Yemen 448
Zambia 450
Zimbabwe 452

ANNEXES

Statistical notes 455

ANNEX A AID-FOR-TRADE KEY DATA 459

Table A.1. Aid for trade by category 459
Table A.2. Aid for trade by category and region 460
Table A.3. Aid for trade by category and income group 461
Table A.4. Aid for trade by individual provider 462
Table A.5a. Top 20 providers of aid for trade in 2017, commitments 464
Table A.5b. Top 20 providers of aid for trade in 2017, disbursements 464
Table A.6. Aid for trade by individual recipient country 465
Table A.7a. Top 20 recipients of aid for trade in 2015, commitments 469
Table A.7b. Top 20 recipients of aid for trade in 2015, disbursements 469
Table A.8. Aid-for-trade regional and global programmes 470
Table A.9. Aid-for-trade regional and global programmes by category 470
Table A.10. Aid-for-trade grants and loans by category 471
Table A.11. Aid-for-trade channels of delivery 471
Table A.12. Aid for trade by provider and category, commitments 472
Table A.13. Aid for trade by provider and by category, disbursements 478
Table A.14. Aid for trade by provider and by region, commitments 484
Table A.15. Aid for trade by provider and by region, disbursements 490
Table A.16. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, commitments 496
Table A.17. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, disbursements 502
Table A.18. Trade-related other official flows by category 508
Table A.19. Trade-related other official flows by individual provider 509
Table A.20. Trade-related other official flows by individual recipient country 511

ANNEX B DAC LIST OF ODA RECIPIENTS BY INCOME GROUP 515

ANNEX C DAC LIST OF ODA-ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES BY REGION 517

ANNEX D AID FOR TRADE: SECTORS AND DEFINITIONS 519

TABLES, FIGURES AND BOXES

CHAPTER 1

Figures

Figure 1.1. Export diversification by country and product category 29
Figure 1.2. Export diversification by markets reached and by country 29
Figure 1.3. Progress reported by respondent in economic diversification 34
Figure 1.4. Long-term trend of export diversification and value of global exports 35
Figures 1.5-1.7. Product diversification, by sub-region 36
Figures 1.8.-1.9. Product diversification, by income groups and region 36
Figure 1.10. Economic diversification at the sectoral level, by region 37
Figure 1.11. Export diversification by agricultural products, by region 37
Figure 1.12. Export diversification in industrial products, by region 38
Figure 1.13. Top constraints to economic diversification for partner countries 39
Figure 1.14. Top constraints to economic diversification, by LLDC, LDC and SIDS respondents 39
Figure 1.15. Top constraints to economic diversification, by region 41
Figure 1.16. Aid for Trade can contribute to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda 48

Boxes

Box 1.1. Why economic diversification matters to developing countries and the LDCs 31
Box 1.2. What factors constrain economic diversification 40
Box 1.3. Economic empowerment as a priority 43
Box 1.4. Joint Declaration on Trade and Women's Economic Empowerment 45

Tables

Table 1.1. Methodology to identify economic and export diversification priorities 32

CHAPTER 2

Figures

Figure 2.1. Cross-border finance to developing countries, 2000-2016 53
Figure 2.2. Destinations of external financing in 2016 54
Figure 2.3. The availability of financing resources at different income levels 55
Figure 2.4. Amounts mobilised from the private sector through development finance interventions 2012 – 17 by income group and sector 55
Figure 2.5. Private philanthropy for trade development 2017 (USD million, disbursements, 2017) 56
Figure 2.6. Aid for trade disbursement by income group, concessionality and category 2006-17 58
Figure 2.7. Aid for trade disbursement by region 2006-17 59
Figure 2.8. Aid for trade disbursement by income group 2006-17 59
Figure 2.9. Aid for trade impacts 62
Figure 2.10. Aid for trade success factors 62
Figure 2.11. ODA committed to building productive capacity 1973-2017 65
Figure 2.12. ODA commitments to trade related infrastructure 71

Figure 2.13. Aid-for-trade commitments by category, USD billion, constant price 2017 75
Figure 2.14. Trade-related OOF commitments by category, USD billion, 2017 constant 75
Figure 2.15. Aid-for-trade commitments by region, USD billion, 2017 constant 77
Figure 2.17. Aid-for-trade commitments by income group, USD billion, 2017 constant 77
Figure 2.18. Trade-related OOF commitments by income group, USD billion, 2017 constant 77

Tables

Table 2.1. My views on how aid for trade is helping to mobilise other forms of development finance 56
Table 2.2. My View on South-South co-operation 57
Table 2.3. Empirical findings on the impact of aid for trade
Table 2.4. My view on economic diversification 63
Table 2.5. My view on the role of agriculture 65
Table 2.6. My view on the role of developing the private sector 66
Table 2.7. My view on the role of a business enabling environment 67
Table 2.8. My views on improving access to finance 68
Table 2.9. My views on the role of tourism 69
Table 2.10. My view on Trade Development 70
Table 2.11. My views on trade-related infrastructure 71
Table 2.12. My views on the contribution of Energy 72
Table 2.13. My views on the contribution of ITC 73

CHAPTER 3

Figures

Figure 3.1. Relationship between GDP growth and manufacturing growth, 1970-2017 82
Figure 3.2. Labour productivity growth index: Developing economies 83
Figure 3.3. An increasing trend in global manufacturing value added, 1990-2017 84
Figure 3.4. The virtuous circle of manufacturing consumption: The global economy 85
Figure 3.5. Share of manufactured goods in global export markets 88
Figure 3.6. Manufacturing employment shares by development group 90
Figure 3.7. Average manufacturing-induced employment by country group 91
Figure 3.8. Decomposition of CO2 emissions production from 1995 to 2013 93
Figure 3.9. Industry-level CO2 emission per unit of real value added 94
Figure 3.10. Share of domestic absorption in final demand for manufactured goods 95
Figure 3.11. Principal constraints to economic diversification 99
Figure 3.12. Trends in formal manufacturing employment by region, 1970, 1990, 2010 and 2016 100
Figure 3.13. Use of industrial robots in different industries 100

Boxes

Box 3.1. Arab region: setting up regional accreditation to overcome technical barriers to trade and promote regional integration 89
Box 3.2. Quality Infrastructure for Trade Facilitation (QI4TF) tool to support market access 96
Box 3.3. UNIDO's Programme for Country Partnership (PCP) 97

CHAPTER 4

Figures

Figure 4.1. Commodity price index (2015=100) 113
Figure 4.2. Trade, remittances and FDI flows to the LDCs and the g7+ LDCs, 2006-2017 118
Figure 4.3. Export concentration in the g7+ LDCs. 119
Figure 4.4. Aid-for-trade flows to the LDCs and the g7+ LDCs, average 2006-2017 120
Figure 4.5. Aid-for-trade disbursements to the g7+ LDCs, per capita, 2013-2017 121
Figure 4.6. Disbursements by aid-for-trade category, 2006-2017 122
Figure 4.7. DTIS Action Matrices: mapping priorities of the g7+LDCs 122
Figure 4.8. Top sectors in the LDCs supported through aid for trade, 2006-2017 123
Figure 4.9. Breakdown of ODA to the New Deal's Peace Building and State Building Goals, by PSG, g7+ LDCs, 2006-2017 124

Boxes

Box 4.1. Boosting export diversification in Togo. 111
Box 4.2. Export diversification in Chad: The promise of gum arabic 113
Box 4.3. The New Deal of Engagement in Fragile States and the Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs). 116
Box 4.4. Channels of trade impact in policical stability and conflict 116
Box 4.5. Strengthening value addition of main cash crops in Comoros 123
Box 4.6. New employment opportunities in the g7+ LDCs: roads for development in Timor-Leste 125

Tables

Table 4.A1. Employment by sector in the LDCs, selected years (percent of total employment) 131
Table 4.A2. Product composition of merchandise exports, 2015-2017 (USD millions and percent) 131
Table 4.A3. Product composition of merchandise imports , 2015-2017 (USD millions and percent) 131
Table 4.A4. Access to electricity in the LDCs, selected years (percent of total population) 132
Table 4.A5. Top exports of g7+ LDCs (continued on following page) 132

CHAPTER 5

Figures

Figure 5.1. Export diversification in Sub-Sharan Africa, 2017. 136
Figure 5.2. Export diversification in selected developing country regions, 2017 137
Figure 5.3. Distribution of employment by aggregate sectors, global and country income groupings, 1991 and 2018 (percentages) 140
Figure 5.4. Competition policy and economic diversification 148

Boxes

Box 5.1. Chile and Zambia: contrasts in diversification trajectories. 141
Box 5.2. Rwanda's export diversification path 147
Box 5.3. Stimulating product upgrading through supplier development programs 152

CHAPTER 6

Figures

Figure 6.1. Regional Distribution of WB-TFSP Activities (by number of countries) 162
Figure 6.2. TFA Measures: Highest Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Demand7 165
Figure 6.3. TFA Measures: Support Types Requested 166
Figure 6.4. TFA Measures: Requests for Awareness-Raising and Capacity Building Support 166
Figure 6.5. TFA Measures: Highest Demand for Legislation Support 167
Figure 6.6. TFA Measures: Requests for ICT, Infrastructure and Equipment Support 167
Figure 6.7. Percent of Countries Supported on Specific TFA Measures 169
Figure 6.8. Forms of Assistance Provided 2017-2018 171
Figure 6.9. Public Sector Recipients of Support 171
Figure 6.10. Percentage Improvement in World Bank Trade Facilitation Indicators WB-TFSP Countries (2016-2019) 176
Figure 6.11. Trade facilitation policy environment supporting SMEs versus large firms in developing economies 177
Figure 6.12. Trade facilitation policy factors underpinning SMEs exports and imports in developing economies 178
Figure 6.13. Montenegro Trade Facilitation Strategy 2018-2022 Action Plan KPI's (excerpts) 180
Figure 6.14. De minimis Customs Duty Amounts in 98 Countries (Global Express Association)26 182
Figure 6.15. TFA Article 7.1 Pre-arrival Processing: Implementation Notifications 185
Figure 6.16. Elements very important to create an environment conducive to ecommerce. 186
Figure 6.17. Correlation between B2C Internet use and TFA Implementation (E-commerce Measures) 187
Figure 6.18. Average percent of implementation of TFA measures and B2C internet use rating per region 188

Boxes

Box 6.1. UNCTAD Trade Facilitation Program 164
Box 6.2. Comments from developing country respondents on trade facilitation 168
Box 6.3. TRS+ - a fuller picture of time incurred 170
Box 6.4. Select country impacts reported 173
Box 6.5. The OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators (TFIs) 175
Box 6.6. Helping SMEs Internationalise through Trade Facilitation 177
Box 6.7. Montenegro Trade Facilitation Strategy (continued on following page) 179
Box 6.8. WCO Immediate Release Guidelines 184
Box 6. 9. Trade Facilitation and E-commerce: Two sides of a coin 186
Box 6.10. Correlation between TFA implementation and B2C internet use rating per region 187

Tables

Table 6.1. WB-TFSP collaboration with other organisations 163
Table 6.2. Percentage of countries aligned: comparison of Tracking Tool Assessments and Category A Notifications 173
Table 6.3. Results of time release studies 174

CHAPTER 7

Figures

Figure 7.1. Share of Manufacturing in exports, 1995-2017 196
Figure 7.2. Herfindahl Hirschman index of product concentration of exports, 1995-2017 196
Figure 7.3. GVC Participation Growth rate (%), 2000-2010 and 2010-2017 197
Figure 7.4. Services exports by main groups of economies, 2010-2018 199
Figure 7.5. Employment in the services sector (% of total), 2000, 2010 and 2018 200
Figure 7.6. Services Trade Restrictions Index by sector, regional averages 201
Figure 7.7. Exports by technological category and partner, selected regions, 1995-2017 203

Boxes

Box 7.1. Trade in services and employment 200

CHAPTER 8

Figures

Figure 8.1. Youth unemployment rates across countries 215
Figure 8.2. Skill shortages and youth employment in SMEs 217
Figure 8.3. Youth entrepreneurship rates by country and gender 221
Figure 8.4. Young managers hire more young people 222
Figure 8.5. Self-reported youth entrepreneurial competencies, by gender 227
Figure 8.6. Access to finance is more of an obstacle for youth-led firms 229
Figure 8.7. How Aid for Trade can best contribute to youth economic empowerment 230
Figure 8.8. taffing needs in the Tunisian textile and clothing sector 232
Figure 8.9. arriers to hiring Gambian youth, by sector 233

Boxes

Box 8.1. Building skills for tourism in Myanmar: An ILO STED case study 218
Box 8.2. Mashrou3i youth entrepreneurship in Tunisia 223
Box 8.3. Youth IT start-ups in the Zaatari refugee camp in Jordan 22

Tables

Table 8.1. Checklist of best practices to skill youth for employability and exports 220
Table 8.2. Checklist of best practices to support youth entrepreneurship 228
Table 8.3. Checklist of best practices in government strategy for youth economic empowerment 233

CHAPTER 9

Figures

Figure 9.1. Main goals donors and partner countries want to achieve through aid for trade 245
Figure 9.2. Views on aid-for-trade contribution to the SDGs 245
Figure 9.3. Trends in Gender Marked Aid for Trade (USD billion, 2016 constant) 247
Figure 9.4. Sector breakdown of gender marked aid for trade 2016-17(USD billion, 2016 constant) 248
Figure 9.5. Sector breakdown of Gender Marked aid for trade in proportion 2016-17 249
Figure 9.6. Areas of aid for trade that donors and partner countries believe can best support women's economic empowerment 250
Figure 9.7. Distribution of Income-groups and regions of gender marked ODF 2016-2017 251
Figure 9.8. Average share of gender focused aid for trade per year 2016-2017 251

Boxes

Box 9.1. Beijing Platform for Action 1995 "Women in the Economy" 242
Box 9.2. The Gender Marker 246
Box 9.3. In my view 250
Box 9.4. Women's economic empowerment in "Aid for Trade" by Australia and EU 252
Box 9.5. Applying a gender lens in supporting private investment by G7 Development Finance Institutions 254
Box 9.6. Guidelines on trade, infrastructure, extractive Industries, and tourism 255
Box 9.7. In my view – Ann Linde, Minister for Foreign Trade, Sweden 264

Table

Table 9.1. Types of activities incorporating gender dimensions in aid for trade 261

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAAA	Addis Ababa Action Agenda
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFD	French Development Agency
AfDB	African Development Bank
AfT	Aid for trade
AIFT	EU-Africa Infrastructure Trust Fund
APPEC	Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BOP	Balance-of-payments
CAR	Central African Republic
CAREC	Central Asia Regional Economic Cooperation
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CRS	Creditor Reporting System
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DTIS	Diagnostic Trade Integration Study
DTISU	Diagnostic Trade Integration Study Update
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EC	European Commission
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EIB	European Investment Bank
EIF	Enhanced Integrated Framework
EU	European Union
FDI	Foreign direct investment
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
FYR Macedonia	Former Yugolslav Republic of Macedonia
GATS	General Agreement on Trade in Services
GATF	Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation
GDI	German Development Institute
GDP	Gross domestic product
GIZ	*Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit*
GNI	Gross national income
GPI	Gender Parity Index
GVC	Global value chain
HICs	Higher income countries
IADB	Inter-American Development Bank
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IDA	International Development Association
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPCC	Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change
IPR	Intellectual property rights
IsDB	Islamic Development Bank
ITA	Information Technology Agreement
ITC	International Trade Centre
ITFC	International Islamic Trade Finance Corporation
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
JICA	Japanese International Cooperation Agency
KFAED	Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development
KNCCI	Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
Lao PDR	Lao People's Democratic Republic
LDCs	Least developed countries
LICs	Low income countries
LIMCs	Lower middle income countries
LLDCs	Landlocked developing countries
LPI	Logistics Performance Index
MICs	Middle income countries

MSMEs	Micro, small and medium enterprises
NCTTCA	Northern Corridor Transit and Transport Coordination Authority
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
OLICs	Other low income countries
OOF	Other official flows
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PPI	Private participation in infrastructure
PPP	Purchasing power parity
PPPs	Public–private partnerships
PPPUSD	Purchasing power parity dollars
PMR	Product market regulation
RECs	Regional economic communities
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SATA	South Africa Telecommunications Association
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIDS	Small island developing states
SIECA	Secretaría de Integración Económica Centroamericana
SMEs	Small and medium enterprises
SPS	Sanitary and phytosanitary
STRI	Services Trade Restrictiveness Index
TBT	Technical barriers to trade
TFA	Trade Facilitation Agreement
TFP	Total factor productivity
TiVA	Trade in value added
TMEA	TradeMark East Africa
TRIPS	Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
UK	United Kingdom
UMICs	Upper middle income countries
UN	United Nations
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNWTO	United Nations World Tourism Organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollar
VAT	Value Added Tax
WB	World Bank
WBG	World Bank Group
WCO	World Customs Organisation
WEF	World Economic Forum
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
OLICs	Other low income countries
OOF	Other official flows
OPHDI	Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative
OSBP	One-stop border post
PIAAC	Programme for International Assessment of Adult Competencies
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PPI	Private participation in infrastructure
PPIAF	Public-Private Infrastructure Advisory Facility
PTD	Post and Telecommunications Department
PPP	Purchasing power parity

PPPs	Public–private partnerships
PPPUSD	Purchasing power parity dollars
PMR	Product market regulation
QoS	Quality of service
RECs	Regional economic communities
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SATA	South Africa Telecommunications Association
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIDS	Small island developing states
SIECA	Secretaría de Integración Económica Centroamericana
SMEs	Small and medium enterprises
SPS	Sanitary and phytosanitary
SSL	Secure sockets layer
ST-EP	Sustainable tourism-eliminating poverty
STRI	Services Trade Restrictiveness Index
TBT	Technical barriers to trade
TFA	Trade Facilitation Agreement
TFP	Total factor productivity
TIP	Telecom Infra Project
TiVA	Trade in value added
TMEA	TradeMark East Africa
TRIPS	Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
UK	United Kingdom
UMICs	Upper middle income countries
UN	United Nations
UNCITRAL	United Nations Commission on International Trade Law
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNWTO	United Nations World Tourism Organization
UPS	United Parcel Service
UPU	Universal Postal Union
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollar
VAT	Value Added Tax
WAPP	West Africa Power Pool
WB	World Bank
WBG	World Bank Group
WCO	World Customs Organisation
WEF	World Economic Forum
WiMAX	Worldwide interoperability for microwave access
WOUGNET	Women of Uganda Network
WSIS	World Summit on the Information Society
WTO	World Trade Organization
WTR	World Trade Report

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2019 aid-for-trade monitoring and evaluation exercise shows that economic diversification and empowerment are core objectives of the trade and development strategies and policies of WTO Members and observers. Many of the 133 respondents to the exercise highlight how economic diversification is a gateway for economic empowerment. What also emerges from the replies is that the link between diversification and empowerment runs in the opposite direction too. Empowerment through skills and training is essential for economic diversification, particularly when it enables youth, women and micro, small and medium sized enterprises (MSMEs) to engage in international trade. Progress is cited in the responses, but it is not uniform, with least-developed, landlocked, and Small Island Developing States facing particular challenges. This is also the case in fragile and conflict afflicted states. For these countries and others, economic diversification is inextricably linked with the achievement of higher levels of productivity resulting from the reallocation of economic resources within and between economic sectors.

Past growth in manufacturing and related services sectors has absorbed large numbers of workers. This increases employment and contributes to prosperity. However, after several decades of so-called "hyper-globalisation", the world may be entering a period characterized by slower growth of trade in physical goods and lower foreign direct investment flows. In addition, the greater automation and digitisation of production processes is changing the nature of manufacturing and the future of industrialisation. Where potential for trade expansion exists, it is likely to contain a significant services component. Action to prevent services restrictions from dampening these growth prospects is needed.

The United Nations Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development calls for economic growth to be inclusive and sustainable. This requires paying greater attention to the social and environmental impact of economic diversification and growth. While this new environment creates challenges, targeted policies promoting economic diversification and structural transformation can create ample opportunities for inclusive and sustainable development. These policies include the supply of appropriate incentive frameworks; investments and policy reforms targeted at reducing trade costs; policies to support adjustment and the reallocation of resources; and government interventions correcting market, policy and institutional failures.

The entry into force of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement is a case in point. Progress is being made. Developing countries' level of alignment to the Agreement is increasing, with notable improvements in publication of measures, automation and streamlining of procedures and engagement with the trade community. Positive impacts from these aid-supported reforms have also been registered. Country reports and periodic time release studies show reduction in customs physical inspections, elimination of unnecessary documents, automation of manual processing steps, and consequent reduction of clearance times.

Economic empowerment can be fostered through programmes that are specifically aimed at improving the extent to which marginalized groups, including women and youth, participate in and benefit from international trade At the same time, small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) are finding it difficult to attract the skilled employees they need to be competitive and trade. The twin problems of youth unemployment and SME competitiveness can and should be solved together; the objectives of youth economic empowerment and SME competitiveness are synergistic. That is, the relationship goes both ways: improved youth skills and innovation promote SME competitiveness and exports, while internationally competitive SMEs provide more and better jobs for young people.

There is widespread agreement that women's economic empowerment is one of the key drivers of sustainable development. Donors have been increasing their attention to gender dimensions in aid for trade. Activities include technical studies or project design that specifically focus on incorporating a gender dimensions in the particular area or activity. However, short-term donor programmes may prove insufficient to bring about meaningful policy changes or to sustain women's economic activities. One approach could include encouraging more awareness raising and training to design gender sensitive investments. This guidance would address two SDGs – Goal 5 which focuses on unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services and infrastructure and Goal 8 which promotes women to be engaged in productive employment.

Many least developed countries have made substantial development progress over the last thirty years. Five countries have transitioned out of LDCs status since 1971 when the category was established, while Vanuatu and Angola are scheduled to do so in 2020-2021. Ten additional countries are at different stages of meeting the graduation thresholds, which points to a heightened pace in recent years. However, 35 LDCs are yet to reach any of the graduation criteria. Progress towards graduation from LDC status requires triggering and sustaining a process of structural transformation to generate economic growth that is both pro-poor and environmentally sustainable.

Since the start of the Aid for Trade Initative in 2006, donors have disbursed USD 409 billion in official development assistance to help developing countries build trade capacities. In addition, USD 346 billion in low concessional loans was disbursed. Almost another USD 100 billion in both type of flows is committed in 2017. South-South providers contributed USD 9 billion according to OECD estimates. Empirical studies and programme evaluations find that this support is helping developing countries improve their competitiveness, expand and diversify their trade, attract foreign direct investment, and create employment.

While economic diversification is essentially a nationally driven process, the international community can offer assistance in creating an enabling environment for the trade integration of developing countries and helping tackling supply-side constraints. To promote empowerment, aid programmes need to focus more explicitly on helping developing countries create more opportunities for women and youth. Youth employment or entrepreneurship can be harnessed by addressing firm level market failures and improving the business ecosystem. Women's empowerment should receive more attention, particularly in sectors such as transport, energy, banking and financial services, as well as mining and industry. In this context, the development of concrete guidance on how to plan, monitor and evaluate donor activities in contributing to women's economic empowerment through aid for trade will be useful. ■

CHAPTER 1
SETTING THE SCENE

Contributed by the World Trade Organization

Abstract: *Economic diversification and economic empowerment embody the rationale for the Aid for Trade Initiative. This chapter discusses insights emerging from the joint OECD-WTO monitoring and evaluation (M&E) exercise which in 2019 focused on surveying these two themes. The starting point for the analysis is the divergence in the number of merchandise products and services exported by countries at different levels of development, at different levels of income and in different geographical circumstances. Against this background, economic and export diversification emerges from the M&E exercise as a core objective of the trade and development policies of partner countries, particularly least developed countries (LDCs) and landlocked developing countries (LLDCs).*

Progress in economic and export diversification is cited in the M&E responses by LDCs and other respondents–advances that are also reported in trade statistics. The progress reported is not however uniform, with countries falling in the UN Small Island Developing States category facing particular issues. Many of the 133 M&E respondents highlight how economic diversification is a gateway for economic empowerment. What also emerges from the replies is that the link between diversification and empowerment runs also in the opposite direction. Empowerment through skills and training can be an essential element in economic diversification, particularly when it enables youth, women and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) to engage in international trade.

INTRODUCTION

From six to more than four and a half thousand. This is the extent of the range of the number of merchandise product categories exported.[1] At the lower end of the scale, São Tomé and Príncipe and Comoros report exports in six and eight product categories respectively in 2017. At the high end of the series, the top three traders (China, United States and the European Union) report merchandise exports in over 4,500 product categories.

About half of countries classified by the United Nations (UN) in the least developed country category (LDCs) export in fewer than 100 product codes. This is below the median (or mid-point) value of 359 product categories, calculated using data classified using the World Customs Organization's Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System (Harmonised System or HS). Among the UN category of Small Island Developing States (SIDS), the average number of HS product categories (236) is also below this median value.

No least developed country (LDC) exports in more than 805 HS code categories. Cambodia, Myanmar, and Bangladesh are the three most diversified merchandise exporting LDCs, trading externally in 542, 688 and 805 HS product codes respectively. No reporter in the UN category of landlocked developing country (hereafter LLDC) exports in more than 1,100 HS code categories. The Republic of Kazakhstan, North Macedonia and Moldova are the three most diversified LLDCs exporting in 604, 721 and 1067 HS codes respectively. On average, LLDCs export in 279 categories. Figure 1.1 overleaf illustrates the range of HS codes in which exports are reported for 157 reporters.


From seven to more than two hundred. This is the extent of the variety in the number of foreign markets reached. At the lower end of the scale, Cabo Verde exports to seven markets while Sao Tome and Principe, South Sudan, and Tonga each send their exports to nine foreign markets. The three largest traders by product category mentioned above (China, US, EU) reach more than 200 markets, along with seven other trading nations: Brazil, India, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Switzerland and Turkey.

On average, LDC exports reach 46 foreign markets, below the median value of 73 for export market relationships. Bangladesh, the LDC whose merchandise exports go to the highest number of markets, exports to 106 foreign markets. Among LLDC reporters, the highest number of markets reached is 111 by Paraguay – a little more than twice the average value of 54 for foreign markets reached by other LLDCs. Among SIDS, Singapore exports to the highest number of export markets (116), followed by Dominican Republic (98) and Mauritius (91). The average number of markets reached by SIDS is 43, three fewer than LDCs. Figure 1.2 outlines the number of markets reached.

Calculating similar values on export diversification for trade in services is complicated by the absence of comparable data sets. A WTO experimental dataset on trade in services collates and estimates services trade statistics in thirty-nine (39) service categories.[2] A median value of twenty-six (26) categories of services' exports can be calculated using data from 198 economies in 2017. LDCs export in an average of 17.3 services' categories. Senegal and Bangladesh registered the highest level of services diversification, exporting in 35 and 33 categories in 2017 respectively. Among SIDS, the average number of services export categories is 19.4, lower than the average for non-SIDS at 26.6. Amongst SIDS there is considerable variation: Haiti and Timor-Leste (LDC SIDS) export in three (3) and six (6) service categories respectively, while Singapore exports in thirty-eight (38) service categories. On average, LLDCs export in 21 categories. Capacity constraints among reporters, particularly for LDCs and SIDS, however, prevent a more accurate picture of services' trade participation emerging.


Increasing exports of goods and services was identified in 2006 by the Aid-for-Trade Task Force as part of the rationale for Aid-for-Trade.[3] In turn, it was argued that effective Aid-for-Trade would enhance growth prospects and reduce poverty in developing countries. The 2018-2019 work programme identified "supporting economic diversification and empowerment for inclusive, sustainable development through Aid-for-Trade" as its central theme - one which encapsulated these two central concerns of growth and poverty reduction.

Figure 1.1. Export diversification by country and product category



Source: WTO Secretariat calculation based on the WTO IDB and UN COMTRADE.

Figure 1.2. Export diversification by markets reached and by country



Source: WTO Secretariat calculation based on the WTO IDB and UN COMTRADE.

Transparency engendered by monitoring and evaluation lies at the heart of Aid for Trade initiative. In the 2019 monitoring and evaluation (M&E) exercise, a self-assessment questionnaire-based exercise conducted jointly by the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) surveyed donors, south-south partners, regional organisations and partner countries. A total of 133 responses were received. Eighty-eight (88) responses were submitted to the partner country questionnaire, 38 of which were submitted by LDCs. South-south partners submitted five responses, the same total as for regional organisations. Bilateral and multilateral donors submitted a total of 36 responses.

The rest of this chapter highlights key points emerging from the survey results. It is organised on the same lines as the self-assessment questionnaires. The questionnaire requested information on the following topics from respondents:

a) Information on economic diversification as a policy priority in national and regional development plans;

b) Progress reported in export diversification and factors constraining export diversification; and

c) Information on economic empowerment as a policy priority in national and regional development plans together with examples of how Aid for Trade had helped meet economic empowerment objectives.

ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AS A POLICY PRIORITY

The 2019 aid-for-trade monitoring exercise highlights the centrality of economic diversification as a policy objective for respondents. Eighty (80) of the eighty-eight (88) answers (91%) to the partner country questionnaire stated that economic diversification is a priority in national or regional development strategies. This number was still higher among LDC and LLDC respondents (100%), where respondents replied with unanimity that economic diversification is a policy priority. Box 1.1 lists some of the reasons offered from a cross-section of respondents for their prioritisation of economic diversification.

Economic diversification is considered a key element of economic development in which a country moves to a less concentrated, more varied production and trade structure. Lack of economic diversification is associated with increased economic vulnerability such that external shocks can undermine the development process. Given that the structure of economies varies, there is no one blueprint for what constitutes economic diversification at a sectoral level (i.e. in terms of the contribution of the agriculture, manufacturing, services sectors). That said, LDCs and other low-income countries tend to have the least varied economic structures frequently with a heavy reliance on agriculture and natural resources, such as fuel oils, gas, copper and other metals.

According to the World Bank, economic diversification occurs when domestic production moves toward new activities within and between sectors. In turn, this leads to better resource allocation and improves overall productivity. Diversification will tend to increase the demand for labour and deliver jobs, of particular importance in resource dominated economies with large youth populations and high unemployment rates.[4] In turn, export diversification can occur through an increase in the variety and volume of exports and/ or trading partners (extensive margin diversification), or through increases in the proportion of products and services that are exported, and/ or through an increase in price for those exports (intensive margin diversification).

Conceptually speaking, economic and export diversification are separate concepts. In practise, policymakers' responses indicate that the notions of economic and export diversification merge into common targets. This tendency can be seen in comments such as that made by Georgia that "economic diversification entails multiple sectors and sub-sectors of the economy including export diversification, SME development, agriculture development, significant industrialisation etc.

Box 1.1. Why economic diversification matters to developing countries and the LDCs

Economic diversification is defined in the different documents cited as a fundamental contributory element to the reduction of poverty in the country – **Benin**.

The Central African Republic is full of important natural resources. But, the base of the economy rests only on some products (coffee, cotton, diamond, wood). Economic diversification is defined as the expansion or development of new sources of income in the country – **Central African Republic**

Diversification is an essential component of the Government's strategies to reverse the trap of low economic growth shown in El Salvador for several decades – **El Salvador**

Our nation is using economic diversification to improve inclusiveness and reduce heavy dependence reliance on resource sectors – **Lao PDR**

Economic diversification is a priority for the national program of emergence for the new government which has just started this January 2019 – **Madagascar**

Export diversification is at the heart of the government aimed at broadening the export base and industrialisation and value addition is embraced to drive the economic growth and sustainable development – **Malawi**

Art 2.1. of Mongolia's Sustainable Development Vision 2030 states: "the economy will be diversified in order to meet the objectives of sustainable economic development" - **Mongolia**

Industrialisation and product diversification are important because of our high reliance on imports and the pressing need to close the huge trade deficit – **Tonga**

The decline in crude oil and petrol commodity prices meant that the country has to look for ways to diversify its economy. – **Yemen**

A further example comes from Zambia where its "Seventh National Development Plan identifies economic diversification as a mechanism that will generate employment opportunities, building a strong manufacturing base and value addition through forward linkages, and diversifying away from non-traditional exports.

Economic diversification objectives are linked by some respondents to specific targets. Among the most specific goals reported are those from Ecuador's national development strategy. Targets to be achieved by 2021 include to "increase the trade balance in relation to gross domestic product from 1.26% to 1.65% by 2021, decrease the concentration rate of non-oil exports by product from 0.1252 to 0.0799, increase agricultural and agro-industrial exports by at least 33% and to grow from USD 55.2 to USD 74.5per capita exports of high, medium and low technological intensity". These targets are part of a broader plan that aims to increase sustainability of the social and solidarity economic system and consolidate dollarization.

Other respondents relate economic diversification to specific policy objectives. For example, Kyrgyzstan foresees "economic diversification through bringing foreign direct investment for modernisation of production facilities."

Some respondents envisage specific policy instruments as a route to achieving economic diversification. Lesotho plans "to tap onto its existing comparative advantage to broaden sources of growth by supporting economic diversification and export competitiveness through developing industrial clusters under productive sectors. The country further needs to establish "Special Economic Zones." Another respondent to mention the role of special economic zones is Liberia who is using them at the Buchanan Port to "move away from dependence of major extractive sectors and looking to increase the domestic production of manufacturing, industrialisation, and value-added products". Mauritania is also looking to the free zone of Nouadhibou to boost its trade with ECOWAS.

The avoidance of certain risks was also identified as a driver for economic diversification action. One motivation mentioned by Mauritania comes from "reducing its vulnerability to external shocks linked to price volatility for natural resources and climate change". Climate change was also mentioned as a driver for action by the Cook Islands. In its reply, the author stated that "it is risky to have 70 percent of our GDP bolstered by tourism, given our vulnerabilities to climate change". Climate change was also mentioned by Mali, Samoa and St Kitts and Nevis in their responses. The Pacific Island Forum Secretariat identified recovery or rebuilding from frequent and severe natural disasters as a factor impinging on economic diversification.

The role of trade policy in support of economic diversification is conceived from quite different perspectives among some respondents. Peru's vision of a "dynamic, diversified, high-tech and regionally balanced economy, with full employment and high productivity of work" is supported by a "strategy of trade opening through diversification into new emerging markets and in the framework of trade agreements". Tajikistan's policy vision is one of "import substitution with regard to the consumer goods, export diversification and expansion of investment opportunities in the national economy". Angola has established a programme to support national production, export diversification and import substitution. Similarly, Côte d'Ivoire also notes its intention to "practice the import-substitution model".

Some respondents take a multi-sectoral approach to economic diversification. Panama's Strategic Plan for 2015-2019, seeks to promote "diversification and productivity of the economic base based on development in the field of logistics and transport, the agricultural sector and rural development, tourism and mining." Environmental sustainability and territorial development are also mentioned as considerations. Likewise, Togo's National Development Plan aims at structural adjustment through growth in the contribution of key sectors (trade, agriculture and fisheries, industry and tourism). Likewise, The Gambia's National Development Plan places "emphasis on the modernisation of the agriculture sector, development of human capital, as well as the need for modern, reliable and efficient energy and infrastructural services."

Some respondents are highly focused in their targeting of economic diversification. In its response, Colombia recalled its 2016 national policy for productive development and the scientific methodology applied to identify productive activities with growth potential. Table 1.1 below highlights the methodology used which assigns a value based on values derived from a productive capacity and export capacity index to identify export diversification targets.

Table 1.1. Methodology to identify economic and export diversification priorities

Productive capacity index		Export capacity index	
Variable	**Weighting**	**Variable**	**Weighting**
Participation % of value added	22.7%	Complexity	33.1%
Jobs	20.3%	Growth % sectoral exports	28.6%
Enterprises	19.6%	Exporting enterprises	25.6%
Growth % of value added	16.4%	Participation % sectoral exports	12.8%
Linkages	11.6%		
Complexity	9.4%		

Source: National Planning Department, Colombia

Other respondents identify specific value chains or products as targets. For example, the Democratic Republic of the Congo has "taken the option to develop agricultural and industrial branches that are channels for economic growth, such as coffee, cocoa and palm oil." Niger cited studies suggesting "clear opportunities for the emergence of value chains and for the development of certain sectors: livestock - meat, hides and skins, onions, cowpeas, potatoes, garlic, peppers."

Expansion of the industrial sector is a desired outcome for some respondents. Indonesia's comment that "industrialisation encourages economic diversification" is echoed in other comments. Uganda stated in its reply that "economic diversification is defined in terms of value addition to traditional export commodities and is measured by the manufactured exports as a percentage of total exports". This perspective on diversification was also shared by Zimbabwe who commented on economic diversification being achieved through "more export product lines, new industries established and with new products produced."

At a regional level, Africa records the highest share of respondents indicating that economic diversification is a priority. Thirty-four (34) of the thirty-five (35) African respondents (97%), of whom 26 are were from LDCs, confirmed their prioritisation of economic diversification. This finding squares with the emphasis placed on this topic in the African Union Commission's shared strategic framework for inclusive growth and sustainable development: "Africa 2063, The Africa We Want."

The response submitted by ECOWAS also underscores the importance of economic diversification. This priority is reflected in a series of regional strategies including, inter alia, the ECOWAS Common Industrial Policy and Action Plan, Agricultural Policy, Private Sector Development Strategy, Technical and Vocational Education and Training Strategy. ECOWAS's revised masterplan 2019-2033 includes indicators to monitor the performance of ECOWAS Industrial Policy and Action Plan, such as percentage increase in exports, percentage increase in the share of industry or manufacturing in GDP, among other indicators.

Services were the focus for diversification activities of some other respondents. Bhutan noted that its "diversification of export products and markets was focussing more on service sectors such as tourism". Tuvalu in its reply suggested that "trade cannot exist while other sectors such as tourism, fisheries, agriculture and labour mobility are not priorities. All sectors are inter-linked and collaborate together to overcome constraints faced by the tourism or any other sector."

The fisheries sector was identified as a sector for economic diversification by various Pacific Island States. In addition to Tuvalu mentioned above, the Cook Islands highlighted that "it is a priority to diversify our economy with fisheries, trade, and offshore financial services. Kiribati also identified fisheries development as among its aid-for-trade priorities, together with tourism.

Fisheries development is cited as a strategic priority in the National Development Plan of The Gambia. Fisheries also features amongst the empowerment objectives of St Kitts and Nevis through the training of fishers in navigation, diving, primary processing of fish, and food safety. Likewise, the Philippines lists fisheries as a sector for the empowerment of marginalised subsectors and people. Zambia refers to an Aquaculture Enterprise Development project benefiting the youth by increasing productivity and promoting market access for fish exports.

EXPORT DIVERSIFICATION: PROGRESS AND CONSTRAINTS


Progress reported by respondents

Forty-seven (47) of the eighty-eight (88) respondents (53%) to the partner country questionnaire reported progress in economic diversification since the launch of the Aid-for-Trade initiative in 2006. Across different regions, Africa records the highest share with 71% of respondents reporting progress in economic diversification.

The share of LDCs reporting progress was 50 per cent higher than that of other respondents. Sixty-six per cent (66%) of LDC respondents reported progress compared with compared with forty-four (44%) among non-LDC respondents.

Not all respondents reported progress in diversification. Five African respondents (Burundi, Comoros, Ethiopia, Central African Republic, and South Sudan) reported that no progress had been made in economic diversification since 2006. Among the constraining factors discussed in more detail in the next section were lack of financing (Burundi), the 2013 crisis (Central African Republic), limited progress in the transformation of traditional products and dependence on a few export products (Comoros).

Figure 1.3. Progress reported by respondent in economic diversification



Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952558

Nine Asian respondents replied positively in relation to economic diversification. Amongst these respondents, Kazakhstan highlighted a 12-fold growth in its foreign trade and a 20-fold increase in industrial output. Lao People's Democratic Republic recalled that its progress was being monitored as part of an LDC graduation process. Asian respondents returned the highest category of "unsure". There was also divergence with answers from the Pacific.


Amongst Pacific respondents, the number of unsure and negative responses on the question of economic diversification outnumbered the positive responses from Kiribati and Vanuatu. Responses from Palau, Samoa, and Tonga indicated that economic diversification had not been achieved. The national authorities in Tonga reported that a "lack of technology, know-how and high cost of spare parts have posed major constraints to the ability of diversifying its economy".

Answers from the Pacific are indicative of a broader trend among SIDS. The share of respondents in the UN SIDS category who reported no progress in economic diversification (17%) was just over twice the number of other non-SIDS respondents (8%). That said, ten SIDS respondents still reported progress (42%). Amongst landlocked developing

countries, more than half of respondents reported progress in economic diversification. Positive self-assessment responses were received from 13 respondents. Among the three LLDC respondents who did not report any progress were: Burundi, Central African Republic and Ethiopia.

In LAC, 11 respondents (61%) reported progress in economic diversification since 2006. One example is Paraguay who in the last four years has seen an "important advance in the industrial sector, which has increased its contribution to the growth of the Paraguayan economy. According to the Central Bank of Paraguay (BCP), 2017 has closed with 9.4% growth in manufacturing industry. During the period from 2013 to 2017, a total of 104 export industries operating under the Maquila Regime have been installed, representing an increase of 259% from the previous five-year period. A total of 9,310 new jobs were created in this sector, 156% more than in that in the previous five-year period."

Figure 1.4. Long-term trend of export diversification and value of global exports



Source: WTO Secretariat calculation based on the WTO IDB and UN COMTRADE.


StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952577

These responses broadly concur with the picture that emerges from trade statistics on export diversification. Figure 1.4 shows the trend in merchandise product export diversification among 157 countries over the period 1996 to 2017, together with the total value of annual exports during the same period.[6] Overall, an increase in diversification is visible over time, in line with an expansion in trade.

A steep increase of export diversification occurs after 2001 accompanied by growth in the value of exports, led by Asian economies and China in particular. This upward trend continued until the beginning of the economic downturn in 2008-09. The slump in exports that followed not only affected overall export volumes, but also led to a drop off in export diversification.


Figures 1.5-1.9 overleaf highlight similar trends by income, region and according to specific UN categories e.g. landlocked, SIDS, LDCs. The same post financial crisis slump is visible in these figures.

Figures 1.5-1.7., Product diversification, by sub-region



Source: WTO Secretariat calculation based on the WTO IDB and UN COMTRADE.


Figures 1.8.-1.9., Product diversification, by income groups and region



Source: WTO Secretariat calculation based on the WTO IDB and UN COMTRADE.

At the sectoral level, agriculture is the sector in which progress in economic diversification has been reported the most, followed by industry and services. Thirty-four (34) out of the eighty-eight (88) respondents reported progress in agriculture, 29 in services and 28 in industry. Agriculture is the top sector in which progress in economic diversification has been recorded by LDCs. Within the LDC group, African LDC report most progress in agricultural diversification. Figure 1.10. below highlights the sectoral distribution across different regions. The top sector in which progress has been reported is agriculture in Africa and services in LAC. Respondents who reported progress at the sectoral level in Asia, largely from the LDCs, identified agriculture and industry as the top sectors.

Figure 1.10. Economic diversification at the sectoral level, by region




Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952596

Again, these findings broadly concur with the story that emerges from trade statistics. Since 2000, Africa has recorded the highest growth rate (70%) of all regions in the number of agricultural product categories exported, up from 54 to 92 HS categories exported in this sector from 2000 to 2017.

Figure 1.11. Export diversification by agricultural products, by region



Source: WTO Secretariat calculation based on the WTO IDB and UN COMTRADE.


StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952615

Among LAC respondents, Honduras highlighted its National Strategy Plan that promoted diversification and growth of employment in light-assembly manufacturing and services, in particular call centres and back office centres. The response from Peru mentions that services exports have increased 2.75 times since 2006.

Among respondents, industrial export diversification was scored most highly by Asian respondents. In view of the remarkable progress made by economies such as Cambodia, Bangladesh and Myanmar in diversification, this is perhaps not surprising. At a trade statistics level, the rate of diversification in African industrial export has been higher, albeit from a much lower base.

In Africa, the number of industrial product categories exported increased by 70% from 133.5 in 2000 to 226.5 in 2017. Across regions, Africa records the strongest growth rate in industry export diversification, followed by Asia (31%) and America (17%).

Figure 1.12. Export diversification in industrial products, by region



Source: WTO Secretariat calculation based on the WTO IDB and UN COMTRADE.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952634


Furthermore, this diversification has been focused regionally with North Africa leading the way, not only in terms of the level of product diversification, but also the growth rate, reaching up to more than 4,000 product export categories in 2017. Southern Africa records the second highest product export diversification in the region, with exports recorded in more than 3,000 HS codes. In contrast, Central, Eastern, and Western Africa exported no more than 700 product categories in the same year.

Constraints to economic and export diversification

Limited industrial or manufacturing capacity is reported by 67 out of the 88 respondents (76%) as the top constraint to economic diversification. Thirty-seven (37) of thirty-eight (38) LDC respondents (97%) also report limited industrial or manufacturing capacity as their major constraint to economic diversification. Figure 1.13. below lists the top constraints to economic diversification for partner countries, including those in the UN categories of SIDS, LLDCs and LDCs.

High trade costs are listed as one of the top three constraints to economic diversification encountered in LLDCs by 14 out of 22 respondents (64%). Among the UN SIDS category, the size of the domestic market emerges as the most critical constraint, as reported by 19 out of 25 respondents. Mauritius, for example, identified its remoteness from major markets coupled with limited natural resources as an obstacle in diversifying its economy. Box 1.2 overleaf discusses some of the factors cited by respondents in their answers on the factors constraining economic diversification.


Figure 1.13. Top constraints to economic diversification for partner countries



Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952653

Figure 1.14. Top constraints to economic diversification, by LLDC, LDC and SIDS respondents



Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952672

Box 1.2. What factors constrain economic diversification

Network infrastructures is severely lacking in Central African Republic. The rate of access to electricity is merely 3%, which makes it difficult to develop or run a business, especially because our country is a landlocked country – **Central African Republic**

Lack of support infrastructure, limited connectivity, and shortage of energy supply are major bottlenecks to economic diversification – **Democratic Republic of the Congo**

Insufficient level of technological sophistication and innovation weigh on diversification in the country. In addition, technical barriers to trade and inadequate infrastructure raise the cost of exports – **Georgia**

Lack of basic infrastructure, such as water, electricity, and telecommunications, coupled with inadequate FDI in productive sectors have limited the capacity to diversify – **Guinea**

Challenges in the area of electronic commerce include low data security, inadequate capacity and infrastructure to collect revenue, cybercrime, high cost of internet connectivity, poor network coverage especially in rural areas, and financial constraints to implement e-commerce initiatives - **Kenya**

Low domestic revenue generation is driven by falling prices of major exports coupled with infrastructural deficit as well as gaps in human capacity and logistics - **Liberia**

In terms of export diversification, there is limited capacity in terms of product development, standards and quality assurance infrastructure. – **Lesotho**

The lack of infrastructure, storage, and transport as well as insufficient supply of energy constitute major obstacles to economic diversification. – **Madagascar**

The rugged terrain in the country results in low accessibility to goods and services as well as markets, which remains a challenge. The enabling environment to support economic activities such as the network infrastructure and transport infrastructure has limited the ability of people to venture into other areas of development. – **Papua New Guinea**

In Senegal, weak essential backbone services sectors, such as telecommunication and financial services, and limited access to factors of production and quality inputs have become major obstacles to promoting economic diversification. This is aggravated by poor private sector dynamics, delays in the implementation of reforms in the energy sector, and low level of productivity, which continues to hamper efforts towards economic diversification - **Senegal**

The low level of know-how and limited access to technology and financial resources have constrained the country's ability to modernise – **Sudan**

Our country experienced a decline in the share of industry in GDP due to lack of national industrial policy and low profitability generated through raw materials processing and low-value added activities as well as a shortage in skilled workers – **Tajikistan**

Inadequate skills and lack of capabilities to utilise the diverse natural resource base of the country in forestry, agricultural products, minerals and fisheries have resulted in weak diversification – **Tanzania**


The main challenges to export diversification include inadequate infrastructure and skills gap - **Uganda**

Despite significant potential for export growth, our competitiveness is still hindered by low productivity, market and product concentration, limited financial access, deteriorating physical infrastructure, and cumbersome regulations and customs procedures – **Ukraine**

Source: OECD-WTO *aid-for-trade monitoring exercise* (2019)

Access to trade finance emerged strongly as a constraint in this year's monitoring exercise. Access to trade finance was cited as an obstacle by 60 out of the 88 respondents (68%) in the partner country questionnaire. In comments to the self-assessment questionnaire, Antigua and Barbuda stated that access to trade finance has become a high priority given the impact of the de-risking phenomenon, which has caused many indigenous Caribbean banks to lose correspondent banking relationships. The author highlighted that the economic impact would be critical if the trend continues to plague the region's financial sector, curbing their ability to participate in international trade.

Figure 1.15. Top constraints to economic diversification, by region



Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952691

Respondents in Asia and Africa identified limited industrial or manufacturing capacity as their top constraint. Interesting to note is that limited access to trade finance came out as the major constraint in LAC and as the second-highest ranked constraint in Asia. In Asia, limited industrial or manufacturing capacity is ranked first by respondents in both LDCs and other developing countries in Asia. Figure 1.15. above discusses the top constraints to economic diversification by region.

Just outside the top ten constraints to economic diversification cited by the respondents are digital connectivity and ecommerce issues. Forty-four (44) of the eighty-eight (88) respondents (50%) cited limited e-trade readiness as one of the main obstacles to economic diversification. In comments, a linkage was also made with network infrastructure development. For example, Mali highlighted the need to increase access to electricity at a lower cost, promote the use of ICT for all sectors and actors, and extend the Internet and voice networks. Affordable and reliable access to electricity underlying digital connectivity was identified as a barrier to economic diversification by 27 respondents, most of whom are from the LDCs.

ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT

The 2019 aid-for-trade monitoring exercise highlights how economic empowerment is being integrated into national and regional policy frameworks. Seventy-nine (79) of the eighty-eight (88) answers (90%) to the partner country questionnaire stated that economic empowerment is a priority in their national or regional development strategies. This share is higher among LDCs (95%) and LLDCs respondents (96%), who stated that economic empowerment is a policy priority.

Africa records the highest share of respondents (94%) with thirty-three (33) out of thirty-five (35) confirming that economic empowerment is a priority in their national and regional development strategy. Twenty-five (25) of these respondents are LDCs.

Questionnaire responses reflect the diversity of approaches undertaken in integrating economic empowerment into national and regional strategies. Togo's National Development Plan targets economic empowerment through inclusive financing. A similar approach is adopted in Sudan and Maldives. Meanwhile, Zambia and Benin devise strategy on economic empowerment around human capital development and skills. In some cases, national development strategies also link economic empowerment to a wider development goal. For example, economic empowerment is viewed as a channel to promote inclusive trade and economic recovery in Central African Republic.

Many respondents noted how economic diversification acts as a gateway for economic empowerment. In its reply, the Democratic Republic of the Congo noted that its national development strategy focused on "access to large markets, partnership between the different actors of regional trade, which will increase the wealth of vulnerable actors of the trade including women and young people." Nepal also highlighted that integrating its "products in the global value chains and promoting business and entrepreneurship skills development for MSMEs are important" for empowerment.

Senegal's national plan places youth and women's employment at the heart of its development strategy with projects being implemented to develop high value-added agriculture activities, fishing, and farming, mining, industrial platforms, logistics hub, "ready to use" export services, tourism, arts and crafts". Further afield, Kiribati's questionnaire notes that "economic empowerment is seen as an enabler to international trade as it contributes to the development of national and global value chains".

The nexus between economic empowerment, economic diversification, and export diversification is reflected in Peru's National Development Strategy, which envisages achieving higher productivity "by stimulating competitive exportable products with high value-added, supporting MSMEs in export consortia, promoting public-private alliances to increase investment in trade infrastructure, and increasing jobs that promote inclusive modernisation. Peru also noted that "to have a competitive economy with high level of employment, priorities also focus on improving the access to labour markets for women, youth, the elderly and people with disabilities."

One point that emerged from these comments is that the link between diversification and empowerment also runs in the other direction. Empowerment also actively contributes to economic diversification in the view of some respondents. This latter perspective is reflected in comments made by Cabo Verde that "economic empowerment requires improving digital and ICT awareness, trade knowledge, language skills, and water supply infrastructure". Nigeria likewise commented that "economic empowerment requires strengthening policy framework, providing an enabling environment for trade, and improving ICT infrastructure".

Box 1.3. Economic empowerment as a priority

Economic empowerment forms one of the axes of the third pillar of the National Plan for Rehabilitation and Peacebuilding with a view to promoting inclusive trade and economic recovery. – **Central African Republic**

The Law for the Promotion, Protection and Development of Micro and Small Enterprises states that strategic alliances between the MSMEs and the Salvadoran population residing abroad will be promoted, with the purpose of creating an intermediation system and investments that promotes their business engagement in the international markets. – **El Salvador**

Support to women's economic empowerment, balanced development, and employment generation are some of the criteria for priority export potentials in the development of Nepal Trade Integration Strategy 2016. – **Nepal**

Most MSMEs face difficulties in obtaining financial support from the banks and other financial institution. Moreover, MSMEs often lack capacity in developing their businesses. – **Papua New Guinea**

Samoa's private sector is made up mostly of MSMEs. As such, interventions to support economic diversification and empowerment should be focused on empowering MSMEs. There is a shift from subsistence / communal living to business start-ups, from micro businesses to small entities and expansion of MSMEs in diversifying exports. – **Samoa**

SMEs account for 99.8% of the economy, which proves the importance that must be given. Senegal has set up several youth programs (ANPEJ, PAPEJF, ONFP, etc.). However, there is a lack of dialogue and harmonisation of actions in certain phases such as orientation, integration through employment, financing of project leaders, training and integration through self-employment. – **Senegal**

The programme in our country focuses on small-scale financing to support women and youth, encouraging their participation in production processes – **Sudan**

The priority includes the development of institutional mechanisms to incorporate national and international commitments on gender equality and women's empowerment in sectoral policies. To promote the creation of productive jobs, priority areas also focus on providing support to SMEs, including for youth and women, especially in high-tech innovative industries. - **Tajikistan**

The strategy is gender sensitive with the aim of increasing women's participation in production and manufacturing. It also focuses on advocacy for women and marginalised groups to have access to finance to boost their participation in regional and international trade. – **Uganda**

The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Development Policy states that government shall through designated agencies and in collaboration with stakeholders facilitate SME access to local and international markets. – **Zambia**

More is expected to ensure women's preferential access to finance, trade support, trade information, business premises in the form of factory shell. It will also promote their participation in local, regional and international exhibitions to create market linkages for women products and improve their networking chances. In that regard, funding is required to strengthen implementation of the COMESA Simplified Trade Regime. – **Zimbabwe**

Source: OECD-WTO *aid-for-trade monitoring exercise* (2019)

Comments made by Togo in its reply were amongst the strongest in considering how empowerment can contribute to diversification. Togo's national development strategy aims at "strengthening the capacities of women and youth to better participate in the national, regional, and international value chains". The Philippines also sees empowerment and inequality reduction as making it easier for the marginalised groups to contribute to economic progress. Zambia also highlighted that "women, MSMEs, and youth are actively involved in economic activities that have potential to create positive impacts such as, income generation, jobs and livelihood improvements". However, they are also "the very group that encounter demand and supply side constraints".

Addressing empowerment constraints may open new market opportunities. Vanuatu highlighted that "the production potential of virgin coconut oil, especially for women and MSMEs to participate in higher-value added activities, is poorly coordinated and largely overlooked." Addressing these constraints could help grow the exports of a product in great demand worldwide.

Sixty (60) of the eighty-eight (88) respondents (68%) stated that their national or regional development strategy includes indicators to track progress on economic empowerment. The share is higher among LDC respondents (79%). Across regions, Africa registers the highest share with 25 of the 35 (71%) respondents in the region confirming that there is an indicator or target for economic empowerment.

Indicators used to track empowerment differ in scope and complexity. Among the straightforward indicators referenced by respondents were those used by the Central African Republic on the number of women or youth who had benefited from capacity-building actions. Comparable indicators were mentioned by Burkina Faso focusing on the number of graduates trained in job search techniques. Burkina Faso's indicators went a step further referencing a metric used by various respondents on the number of jobs created.

Several respondents highlighted targets linked to employment, particularly for youth and women. The Gambia's National Development Plan includes targets to reduce youth unemployment from 38% to 30% by 2021. Togo has set a target to reduce the youth unemployment rate from 3.2% in 2015 to 2.5% in 2022. The rate of female participation in the labour market is a metric used by Mexico. A target to reach 48% in 2018 has been set, together with other targets including reducing the percentage share of employed women without access to day care by 75% and lowering salary discrimination index per sector by at least 20%. The Philippines tracks additional criteria beyond female labour force participation, such as the percentage of females with advanced degrees employed. Several respondents also referred to concepts such as decent work (Tonga) and adequate employment (Peru).

Access to credit is a parameter tracked by various respondents, both as an indicator for women's economic empowerment and as an indicator for MSMEs. Togo has a target to "increase the share of women with access to credit from 44.4% in 2015 to 60% in 2022." Papua New Guinea tracks the number of women with a credit account as part of a broader set of indicators that also includes youth employment, women engaged in SMEs, the share of MSMEs having access to financial credits and the number of registered MSMEs. The Philippines Development Plan Results Matrices for 2017-2022 measures the proportion of small-scale industries in total industry value-added, the number of MSMEs and the share of bank loan portfolio allocated to MSMEs amongst its indicators. The access of female entrepreneurs to credit is also cited by Iraq and Madagascar as an issue to address

One note of caution sounded by Peru in relation to the use of economic empowerment is the lack of additional information and indicators, for example, on the number of companies led by women and those who export. To this concern, could also be added the ability of many statistical offices to capture and track such metrics over time.

The rest of this section is organised around specific comments made by respondents on empowerment in relation to youth, women and MSMEs.

Empowerment and youth

Several respondents referred to youth empowerment targets, notably from an employment perspective. In comparison with the other two areas surveyed of women's economic empowerment and MSMEs, the comments pertaining to youth were not as extensive.

The respondent from Papua New Guinea highlighted the difficulties youth face in securing jobs after graduation and the need to equip them with skills and financial backing to encourage their participation in the economy. Likewise, the respondent from Madagascar cited the "lack of experiences and start-up funding" as major barriers to youth entrepreneurship. This issue was codified into the law governing national youth policy in Madagascar in 2015, which recognises that "young people are the first victims of unemployment". To that end, "socio-economic inclusion of youth and the promotion of youth entrepreneurship" is enshrined in the strategy of Madagascar. In a similar vein, Papua New Guinea noted that youth has not been given sufficient support in all areas to ensure they are employed and participate meaningfully in economic activities.

Policy approaches to address youth empowerment include statements in national development strategies. Senegal noted that "the employment of youth and women have been at the heart of the development strategy" in Senegal. In Zambia, the government has put in place a youth empowerment and employment strategy with policy interventions addressing challenges on youth empowerment.

Other references were made to more specific actions, such as vocational training by Guinea and entrepreneurship programmes by St. Kitts and Nevis. The integration of youth into projects was highlighted by Zambia through its Aquaculture Enterprise Development and Cassava value chain projects.

Empowerment and women

Gender has been an important element of the Aid for Trade initiative since its inception. Reference can be found in the Aid for Trade Task Force recommendations from 2006. The Joint Declaration on Trade and Women's Economic Empowerment launched at the Buenos Aires WTO Ministerial Conference in 2017, identified aid for trade as an instrument to analyse, design and implement more gender-responsive trade policies.

The 2019 aid-for-trade monitoring exercise highlights how economic empowerment is being integrated into national and regional policy frameworks by partner countries and regional organisations, as well as donors and south-south partners. Responses from the monitoring exercise suggest that women's economic empowerment is a critical component of inclusive and sustainable growth.

Data shows an increasing focus by partner countries' national and regional development strategies on women's empowerment since the inception of the Initiative. This latter trend emerges strongly from responses to the joint OECD-WTO 2019 Monitoring and Evaluation Exercise. In fact, there is little to separate donor and partner countries in their promotion of women's economic empowerment in the aid for trade plans (84% of donors indicated it was a priority) and national or regional development strategies (85% of partner countries highlighted it as a concern to address). Furthermore, both groups highlighted mainstreaming women's economic empowerment as a factor leading them to update their strategies.

Efforts to empower women are also reflected in various policies to achieve this aim. For example, Kazakhstan mentioned its "long-standing policy of legislative support to women. As the first Central Asian country to set up a national entity to promote gender equality, Kazakhstan approved in 2016 the Concept of Family and Gender Policy up to 2030, to prevent gender-based discrimination and imbalances."

Box 1.4. Joint Declaration on Trade and Women's Economic Empowerment

We have agreed to collaborate on making our trade and development policies more gender-responsive, including by:

1. Sharing our respective experiences relating to policies and programs to encourage women's participation in national and international economies through World Trade Organization (WTO) information exchanges, as appropriate, and voluntary reporting during the WTO trade policy review process;
2. Sharing best practices for conducting gender-based analysis of trade policies and for the monitoring of their effects;
3. Sharing methods and procedures for the collection of gender-disaggregated data, the use of indicators, monitoring and evaluation methodologies, and the analysis of gender-focused statistics related to trade;
4. Working together in the WTO to remove barriers for women's economic empowerment and increase their participation in trade; and
5. Ensuring that Aid for Trade supports tools and know-how for analysing, designing and implementing more gender-responsive trade policies.

Source: Joint Declaration on Trade and Women's Economic Empowerment on the Occasion of the WTO Ministerial Conference in Buenos Aires in December 2017

Mainstreaming of women's economic empowerment is evident through the incorporation of national and international commitments on women's economic empowerment. This is the case for example of sectoral policies in Tajikistan. The importance of embedding women's economic empowerment as a cross-cutting issue across development policy was also highlighted. Responses received from the Democratic Republic of the Congo underscored the importance of "considering the gender dimension in all activities". To that end, in the next five years, national action is expected "in the direction of strengthening the capacity of women's empowerment and to advocacy for the implementation of laws in favour of women."

The link between economic empowerment and international trade is reaffirmed by a number of respondents. The national development strategy in the Democratic Republic of the Congo "associates economic empowerment with the participation of women and youth in international trade". Zimbabwe acknowledges the "important role women play in informal cross-border trade" and the need for "gender mainstreaming in the implementation of the National Trade Policy". In Malawi, "special preferences are given to women involved in cross-border trade." Guinea continues to "support associations of women to participate in trade promotion activities such as fairs and exhibitions".

The potential of simplified trade regimes and streamlining custom procedures as a lever for economic empowerment, particularly women and MSMEs, is cited in some response. Zimbabwe underscored the need to channel more "funding to strengthen the implementation of COMESA simplified trade regime" to better establish market linkages for women. Kenya stated that "the simplified custom procedures established in EAC provide opportunities for SMEs".

The experience in some countries demonstrates the role that digitalisation may play in advancing women's economic empowerment. In Iraq, the Internet, especially social networking sites, has played a role in promoting women's economic empowerment. The Democratic Republic of the Congo attributes women's increased production and better access to markets to modern communication techniques. Responses also highlight room for improvement in this area. Guinea, for instance, articulated the need for further support in training women entrepreneurs in modern trade techniques. Over 30 respondents in the questionnaire identified digital connectivity and ICT skills as a way Aid-for-Trade can contribute to economic empowerment for women.

Ukraine indicated the need for a threefold approach including for "export companies to implement gender equality, especially in promotion and decision-making, for women to develop their capacity, and for women-led businesses to have access to national and international business networks for business opportunities and export".

Empowerment and MSMEs


One of the primary motivations for economic empowerment is the prominent role MSMEs play as the backbone of economies. For example, Samoa recognises that MSMEs constitute the largest share of the economy and argues that there is a need to direct "interventions to support economic diversification and empowerment on empowering MSMEs". MSMEs role as a major source of employment is referenced by Kazakhstan and Maldives. In its submission, Senegal states that the share of employment attributed to MSMEs (99.8% of the economy) should guide the level of importance given to economic empowerment. Similarly, Guinea considered the empowerment of MSMEs as the "basis for development, especially for the LDCs".

Responses also revealed linkage of MSMEs with export diversification. The MSME Development Policy of Zambia focuses on facilitating access to local and international markets. Honduras noted that reductions in trade cost will largely benefit MSMEs – a point echoed by Kenya, which mentioned "the benefits of simplified custom procedures under EAC ."

MSMEs' viability very much depends on key enabling factors including skills and access to finance, which were the top two most frequently cited factors in the questionnaire responses. Nepal highlighted the importance of "promoting business and entrepreneurship skills for MSMEs". Human capital development forms an integral part of the national and regional development strategy with the overarching goal of improving employment in some including Benin, Zambia, and the Philippines. Zambia's response highlighted that "women, MSMEs, and youth are actively involved in economic activities that have potential to create positive impacts such as, income generation, jobs and livelihood improvements". However, they are the very groups that also encounter demand and supply side constraints.

Access to financing is one of the pressing issues frequently mentioned in the context of achieving economic empowerment for MSMEs. Access to finance poses challenges in Papua New Guinea in that MSMEs are unable to obtain financial support from banks and financial institutions, hampering progress in economic empowerment. To address such challenges, particularly high collateral requirement, Maldives has established a SME bank in February 2019 focusing on SME financing and development. Kazakhstan considers access to finance a catalytic factor for the empowerment of MSMEs. Access to finance is proved important not only for MSMEs, but also women and youth. Access to finance has also been identified as a channel to empower the marginalised groups by facilitating their participation in regional and international trade, as stated by Uganda.

Figure 1.16. Aid for Trade can contribute to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda



Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952710

CONCLUSIONS

Responses from the 2019 monitoring exercise show clear recognition that both economic diversification and empowerment strengthen the rationale for aid-for-trade as a driver of economic growth, industrialisation and innovation. This is in line with the objective for the Aid-for-Trade first articulated by the 2006 Task Force, that is: "to help developing countries, particularly LDCs, to build the supply-side capacity and trade-related infrastructure that they need to assist them to implement and benefit from WTO Agreements and more broadly to expand their trade".

Among partner country respondents, there is clear appreciation of the role that Aid-for-Trade can play in making a contribution to the achievement of the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, notably to SDG 8 (decent work and economic growth) and SDG 9 (industry, innovation, and infrastructure). Figure 1.18. below highlights the responses from partner countries.

NOTES

1. The bilateral export flows at HS 6-digit level with values less than USD 100,000 are excluded in the product counts.
2. The WTO Trade in Services Dataset by Mode of Supply (TiSMoS) includes estimates produced by the WTO Secretariat to ensure a full coverage of services categories. A threshold of USD 50,000 is applied for each of the 39 EBOPS items, namely SA, SB, SC11, SC12, SC13, SC21, SC22, SC23, SC31, SC32, SC33, SC4, SDA, SDB1, SDB2, SDB3, SE1, SE2, SF, SG, SI1, SI2, SI3, SJ1, SJ21, SJ22, SJ311, SJ312, SJ313, SJ32, SJ33, SJ34, SJ35, SK1, SK21, SK22, SK23, SK24, SH.
3. WT/AFT/1
4. World Bank, "Economic Diversification Guidance Note", Trade and Competitiveness Global Practice Available at: http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/sites/default/files/Data/reports/EconomicDiversification.pdf
5. Departamento Nacional de Planeación, Colombia "Metodología tipo de pre-identificación de apuestas productivas a nivel Departamental Ministerio" Marzo de 2017, Available at: https://colaboracion.dnp.gov.co/CDT/Desarrollo%20Empresarial/Metodologia%20Priorizacion%20PDP%20-%20FINAL.pdf
6. A revised version of 'HS diversification index' used in the technical paper in the World Tariff Profile 2017. The 'HS diversification index' is defined as a country's total number of export trade flows at HS 6-digit level with all trading partners (destination markets). Thus, the index provides a measurement of both broadness product categories and diversity of export markets. It should be noted that the index does not consider trade volumes. Although trade values could be useful in measuring intensity vis-à-vis product diversity, it could also distort the measurement of pure export potential as this could be under-estimated when trade values are given too much importance.

CHAPTER 2

AID FOR TRADE, ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND EMPOWERMENT

Contributed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Abstract: *Since the start of the Aid for Trade Initative, donors have disbursed USD 409 billion in official development assistance to help developing countries build trade capacities. In addition, USD 346 billion in low concessional loans was disbursed. In 2017, aid-for–trade commitments reached USD 57.7 billion, one and a half times the base line average. Empirical findings and evaluations show that this support has helped developing countries improve their competitiveness, expand and diversify their trade, attract foreign direct investment, and create employment for men and women. Despite these positive results, many developing countries continue to specialise in activities with low value added. This means that aid programmes need to focus more explicitly on helping them diversify their economy and create more opportunities for empowering women and youth.*

OVERVIEW

Many developing countries and particularly the least developed, continue to face major competitive challenges in their drive to diversify their economies. Although reductions in trade costs coupled with the diffusion of information and communications technologies are opening up new opportunities, many developing countries continue to face considerable obstacles in maximising their economic potential. In countries that are succeeding in exploiting competitive opportunities, success can be difficult to replicate at national level. This could create "islands of excellence" with the rest of the economy operating at lower levels of capital and knowledge intensity. Factors that influence economic diversification are manifold and context or geographic specific (as is the case of small islands and landlocked developing economies). Some of the barriers to economic diversification are part of the constraints that aid for trade is tackling. They are also highlighted in answers provided to the OECD-WTO 2019 Monitoring and evaluation exercise.

Since the start of the WTO-led Aid for Trade Initiative in 2006, some 60 donors that report their official development assistance (ODA) to the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS) have disbursed USD 409 billion to build trade-related capacities and infrastructure. They provided USD 5,7 billion to help developing countries elaborate trade development strategies and negotiate and implement trade agreements. Furthermore, USD 91.6 billion was disbursed to improve energy supply; USD 125.4 billion to build roads, ports, and telecommunications networks; USD 180 billion to support the private sector; and USD 230 million to help countries pay for the costs associated with trade liberalisation. In addition, USD 346 billion in low concessional loans has also been disbursed since 2006. In 2017, aid for trade commitments increased by 12,1% in real terms and reached USD 57 billion, almost one and half times the 2002 – 06 base line average. This number is supplemented with USD 9 billion from South-South providers who are growing in importance as a source of financing for developing countries, although little can be said about how much of this total is trade related.

Empirical findings clearly show that this support has helped developing countries expand and diversify their trade, improve competitiveness, attract foreign direct investment, and create employment for men and women. These empirical findings are corroborated by case stories that were submitted in the context of earlier aid for trade monitoring exercises. Results, however, vary depending on the type of aid-for-trade intervention, the sector at which the support is directed, the income level, and the location of the recipient country.

Evaluations have found that targeted support, no matter how well designed and implemented, is unlikely to bring about sustained gains for the poor without simultaneous policy and institutional reform. But focusing support exclusively on the enabling environment ignores that micro and small enterprises often lack the capacities needed to exploit new market opportunities. Moreover, women and youth are frequently disadvantaged in their economic capabilities and also suffer from discrimination and lack of political voice to influence policy outcomes. Empowerment is essential for addressing the multiple dimensions of exclusion. Policies and investment need to focus more explicitly on expanding the economic opportunities for women and youth. Thus, aid for trade programmes should consider political economy factors that affect the position of women and youth in particular in relation to future demands for employment.


This chapter starts with an overview of the financing for development flows to provide the context for the more in-depth analysis of the aid for trade disbursement since the start of the Initiative in 2006. Next, the chapter highlights academic findings about the effectiveness of aid for trade in expanding and diversifying trade, attracting investment and promoting economic diversification and empowerment. This is followed by a section looking in more detail at those aid-for-trade disbursements that are considered most relevant for promoting economic diversification and empowerment. Next, the short-term outlook for aid for trade is presented.

FINANCING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The vision underpinning the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda is broad and ambitious; it calls for an equally broad and ambitious financing strategy. The first International Conference on Financing for Development in 2002 singled out trade as often the most important external source of development finance. The 2015 Conference and the resulting Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AAAA) no longer highlight trade as a source of development finance. Instead, the Agenda points towards domestic resources and foreign direct investment, while stressing the need for a substantial additional contribution from the private sector. Trade is referred to as an engine for growth and development. Both the SDGs and aid for trade objectives are dependent on integrated policy approaches and trade-offs. This implies that aid for trade should contribute to the economic objectives of developing countries by helping them to connect their firms to international markets, and expand and diversify trade. At the same time, aid for trade should help achieve social objectives by reducing poverty and inequalities. Finally, aid for trade should pursue environmental objectives through helping developing countries adapt to climate change, while exploiting comparative advantages in low-carbon production (Lammersen, 2019). The next section will sketch the financing for development context and provide an overview of the aggregate aid-for-trade disbursements since the start of the Initiative in 2006.

In 2016, international actors, both public and private, provided almost USD 1.7 trillion in external finance to developing countries, up from roughly USD 675 billion in 2000. The private sector transfers the bulk with around USD 750 million in different forms of investments. Migrants who send home USD 416 billion in remittances are also important, albeit only for a limited number of developing countries. Official providers with combined resources amounting to USD 310 billion target poverty reduction, the poorest countries, and global programs. South-South co-operation flows from ten major countries beyond the DAC are estimated to be USD 9 billion in 2017 up from USD 6.2 billion in 2016 (Figure 2.1).

Figure 2.1. Cross-border finance to developing countries, 2000-2016




Source: OECD calculations based on OECD (2018), Creditor Reporting System (database), https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=crs1; World Bank (2018), Migration and Remittances Data http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/migrationremittancesdiasporaissues/brief/migration-remittances-data; IMF (2017), Balance of Payments database, http://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/datasets/BOP

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952729

These different flows vary by the type of destination. Low-income countries (LICs) tend to rely more on official and in particular concessional flows, while for lower middle-income countries (LMICs) remittances are a major source of external financing. Together with upper middle-income countries (UMICs), they also attract the largest volume of non-concessional official flows. The major share of private finance goes to UMICs, but is an important source for LMICs as well. Thus, the types of external financing seem to be strongly correlated to income levels, with the composition of cross-border finance changing along the development continuum (OECD, 2019) (Figure 2.2).

Figure 2.2. Destinations of external financing in 2016




Source: OECD calculations based on OECD (2018), Creditor Reporting System (database), https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=crs1; World Bank (2018), Migration and Remittances Data remittances; IMF (2017), Balance of Payments

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952748

The weight of international public finance declines as national income improves. Official development assistance (ODA), in particular, is the dominant component of external resources for LICs and LMICs constituting between 50%-60% of total external flows. ODA and other official flows (OOF) become less relevant for UMICs, making up less than 10% of external finance. As access to international capital markets becomes available at higher income levels, private finance rises in importance. Remittances are important for LICs, but their share in external financing is highest for LMICs and UMICs. While private flows represent around 30% of all external financing for LICs, they make up 70% of external finance for the richest or UMICs (Figure 2.3).

Development finance intervention mobilised from the private sector amounted to USD 154 billion during 2012 - 17. Africa was the main beneficiary with USD 40.8 billion, followed by Asia (USD 37.5 billion), Europe (USD 32 billion), Latin America and the Caribbean (USD 25.1 billion), with only USD 0.1 billion destined for Oceania. Within these different regions, the overwhelming share of the amounts mobilised supported projects in the UMICs (54%) and LMICs (36%) with only 10% for the LDCs and other low income countries (OLICs). Banking and financial services (USD 43.7 billion), energy (USD 38.9 billion) and industry, mining and construction (USD 28.8 billion) attracted the overwhelming portion of this type of development finance (Figure 2.4).


Figure 2.3. The availability of financing resources at different income levels



Source: OECD (2018), Creditor Reporting System (database), https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=crs1; World Bank (2018), Migration and Remittances Data http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/migrationremittancesdiasporaissues/brief/migration-remittances-data; IMF (2017), Balance of Payments database, http://www.imf.org/external/datamapper/datasets/BOP

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952767

Figure 2.4. Amounts mobilised from the private sector through development finance interventions 2012 – 17 by income group and sector



* For 2016 and 2017, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) did not share information on the sectoral and geographic breakdowns of its private mobilisation due to confidentiality constraints. This amount represents USD 10.3 billion

Benn, J., C. Sangaré and T. Hos (2017), "Amounts Mobilised from the Private Sector by Official Development Finance Interventions: Guarantees, syndicated loans, shares in collective investment vehicles, direct investment in companies, credit lines", OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers, No. 36, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/8135abde-en.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952786

Table 2.1. My views on how aid for trade is helping to mobilise other forms of development finance

"The persistence of the political crisis has made it difficult to mobilise foreign private financing." – **Central African Republic**

"The only funding has come from the EIF, there has been no non-concessional financing or FDI." – **Senegal**

"Over the last ten years, around EUR 3.4 billion of EU grants funded over 380 blended project, this has leveraged EUR 26.2 billion of loans and has helped unlock EUR 57.3 billion of investments of in developing countries."- **European Union**

"Many of operations involve co-financing that helps mobilise concessional and non-concessional financing sources locally and internationally." – **EBRD**

"By helping to lower the risks for investments, recipient countries can mobilise additional sources of development finance, particularly FDI that promotes sustainable diversification gains." – **World Bank**


"Our assistance, including private sector instruments, fully mobilises private sector capital." – **Japan**

Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

Forty out of 88 respondents to the OECD-WTO 2019 partner country questionnaire and 24 out of 35 respondents to the donor questionnaire stated that the aid for trade has helped them mobilise other forms of development finance. More than half of the forty respondents belong to the LDCs. Among the South-South respondents, Turkey highlighted that aid for trade mobilises other forms of development finance.

Philanthropic grants to developing countries amounted to almost USD 8 billion on average per year during the period 2015 – 17. MICs received 67% of total philanthropic flows with 37% going to LMICs and 30% to UMICs. The remainder went to the LICs. Around USD 963 million is reported with the trade development marker with over half allocated to agriculture and fishery, and almost a quarter to banking and related services. Support for activities in the energy and industry sectors often do not relate to actual construction of infrastructure or production, but is rather focused on transparency, accountability and democratic participation (Figure 2.5a). Although the Gates foundation provides half of all funding, foundations such as MasterCard, United Postcode Lotteries, and others are also important providers (Figure 2.5b)

Figure 2.5a. and 2.5b. Private philanthropy for trade development 2017 (USD million, disbursements, 2017)



Source: OECD (2018), Private Philanthropy for Development, The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264085190-en.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952805

A number of significant providers of development co-operation do not report their development finance flows to the OECD. A conservative estimate by the OECD indicates that total gross concessional development finance by ten non-reporting countries amounted to USD 9 billion in 2017. Little can be said about how much of this amount is provided for trade related programmes or projects. The Second High-level United Nations Conference on South-South Cooperation, noted the role of trade in the growth and economic development of developing countries and recognised the significant contribution of South-South and triangular cooperation in the area of trade and its ability to promote sustainable development. Fifty partner countries, of which 27 LDCs, identified China as the South-South partner that provides most financing for economic diversification, followed by India that was identified by 30 partner countries. South-South providers reported that they focused their support for economic diversification in Djibouti, Egypt, Mauritania, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, and Tunisia.

Table 2.2. My View on South-South co-operation

"*China is supporting the rehabilitation or construction of our trade related infrastructure.*" – **Central African Republic**

"*India offers trade related capacity building to government officials and China provides development finance for building infrastructure.*" – **Nepal**

"*China, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Kuwait and Tunisia have been partners for a long time.*" – **Guinea**

"*We have developed economic relations with South-South partners such as China, Iran, India, Turkey, among others.*"- **Senegal**

"*The India, Brazil, South Africa help diversifying economic activities in the coconut sector.*" – **Kiribati**

"*China and India are orienting their investments to source raw materials.*" – **Democratic Republic of Congo**

"*We promote and leverage South-South cooperation modalities to support sustainable development around the world across programmatic areas.*" - **UNDP**

Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)


Triangular co-operation combines different types of resources (financial, in-kind, knowledge, technology or other resources) and harnesses the comparative advantages of each partner, aiming at an impact that is greater than the sum of the individual interventions. It was first introduced in the 1970s and gained popularity in recent years according to surveys and analyses (OECD, 2017). These trends are confirmed by data from the Ibero-American General Secretariat that show an eight-fold increase in the number of triangular co-operation projects in Latin America and the Caribbean between 2005 and 2015. Out of the seven donors indicating partnerships with South-South providers, four mentioned Argentina, Brazil and Mexico, three referred to partnerships with Chile, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand. Germany noted that it collaborates with South-South providers across different regions, including Chile, China, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and 9 others. Japan provides financing for economic diversification with multiple partners including Argentina, Thailand, Egypt and 8 others. The United States mentioned Mexico and Singapore.

AID FOR TRADE DISBURSEMENTS SINCE 2006

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda noted, "Aid for Trade can play a major role and should strive to allocate an increasing proportion going to least developed countries." SDG 8 reiterated this call to "increase aid-for-trade support for developing countries, in particular least developed countries." Since the start of the WTO-led Aid for Trade Initiative, some 60 donors that report their official development flows to the OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS) have disbursed a total of USD 409 billion in official development assistance to build trade capacities and trade-related infrastructure. Disbursements grew on average 9.3% annually from USD 14.9 billion during the 2002 – 05 baseline period to USD 42.2 billion in 2017.

This ODA has helped developing countries elaborate trade development strategies; negotiate and implement trade agreements (USD 5,7 billion); generate energy (USD 91.6 billion); build roads, ports, and telecommunications networks to better connect domestic firms to the regional and global markets (USD 125.4 billion); support the private sector in exploiting their comparative advantages and diversifying their trade (USD 180 billion); and, help countries pay for the costs associated with trade liberalisation (USD 230 million) (Figure 2.6).

Figure 2.6. Aid for trade disbursement by income group, concessionality and category 2006-17




Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 06 February 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952824

Aid for trade has been disbursed to 146 countries or territories, with USD 154.7 billion spent in Asia, USD 146 billion in Africa, USD 38.6 billion in Europe, USD 32,7 billion in Latin America and the Caribbean and USD 5 billion in Oceania (Figure 2.7). Within these regions LICs received USD 118 billion (LDCs USD 108.4 billion and OLICs USD 10.2 billion), LMICs USD 143.8 billion and UMICs USD 83.4 billion, while regional and global programmes got USD 63.5 billion between 2006 -17 (Figure 2.8). In volume terms, the ten largest aid-for-trade donors (i.e. Japan, the EU, the World Bank, the United States, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the Netherlands) provided together 82% of total disbursements since 2006. However, in terms of aid for trade as a share of country programmable aid, the ranking differs with the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (80% share) on top, followed by the OPEC Fund for International Development (66%), Belgium (63%), Kuwait (61%), Austria (61%), and the European Union (60%). Australia set a target in 2014 to increase the share of its aid for trade portfolio to 20% of its aid budget by 2020. The target was met ahead of schedule, when Australia's aid for trade reached 23.3% of the total aid budget in 2016-17.


Figure 2.7. Aid for trade disbursement by region 2006-17



Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 06 February 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952843

Figure 2.8. Aid for trade disbursement by income group 2006-17



Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 06 February 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952862

Development banks together with a number of bilateral donors (i.e. the European Union, France, Germany, and Korea) also provided a total of USD 346 billion in low concessional loans or other official flows (OOF) since 2006. These OOF targeted mostly MICs (USD 318 billion) in Asia (42%) and Latin America and the Caribbean (23%) in the area of transport and storage (USD 84 billion), banking and financial services (USD 75 billion), energy generation and supply (USD 75 billion) and industry (USD 55 billion).

IS AID FOR TRADE WORKING?

Aid for trade is found to be effective both at micro and macro levels according to a broad range of empirical trade and development studies (Table 2.2). More specifically, OECD found that one dollar extra invested in aid for trade generates nearly eight additional dollars of exports from all developing countries – and twenty dollars for the poorest countries (OECD/WTO, 2013). Results, however, may vary considerably depending on the type of aid-for-trade intervention, the sector at which the support is directed, the income level, and the location of the recipient country.

Table 2.3. Empirical findings on the impact of aid for trade


Finding	Source
Product-specific technical assistance projects coincided with increased exports of supported product line	Brenton, P., and Uexkull, E., (2009), *Product Specific Technical Assistance for Exports – Has it been Effective?*, Journal of International Trade and Economic Development, 18: 235–254, https://doi.org/10.1080/09638190902916444
Aid for trade has an overall positive and significant impact on exports from recipient countries.	Cali, M., and Te Velde, D.W., (2011), *Does Aid for Trade Improve Trade Performance?*, World Development, Elsevier, Vol. 39(5), pages 725-740, https://econpapers.repec.org/article/eeewdevel/v_3a39_3ay_3a2011_3ai_3a5_3ap_3a725-740.htm
A 10% increase in aid to transportation, ITC, energy, and banking services is associated with increases of 2.0%, 0.3%, 6.8% and 4.7% respectively in the exports of manufactured goods from recipient countries.	Ferro, E., Portugal-Perez, and Wilson, J., (2012), *Aid to the Services Sector: Does it Affect Manufacturing Exports?*, The World Bank, http://www.ferdi.fr/sites/www.ferdi.fr/files/DT_Ferro_Perrez_Wilson_Manufacturing%20Exports.pdf
A 10% increase in aid for infrastructure commitments per capita in developing countries leads to an average 2.34% increase in the exports over GDP ratio	Vijil, M., and Wagner, L., (2012), *Does aid for trade enhance export performance? Investigating the infrastructure channe*l, The World Economy, 35(7), 838-868, https://doi/full/10.1111/j.1467-9701.2012.01437.x
Aid for trade can be a powerful and effective tool to lower trade costs in developing countries and thus to increase trade flows.	Busse, M., Hoekstra, R., and Königer, J., (2012), *The Impact of Aid for Trade Facilitation on the Costs of Trading*, Kyklos, 65: 143–163, https://doi:10.1111/j.1467-6435.2012.00531.x
A 1% increase in aid for trade facilitation could generate an increase of USD 415 billion in global trade	Helble, M.C., Mann, C.L., and Wilson, J.S., (2012), *Aid-for-trade facilitation*, Review of World Economics (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv), Springer, vol. 148(2), pages 357-376, https://www.jstor.org/stable/41485799
Differences in program design and implementation may account for differences in aid-for-trade export effects	Rueckert Brazys, S., (2013), *Evidencing donor heterogeneity in Aid for Trade*, Review of International Political Economy, 20:4, pages 947-978, https://DOI:10.1080/09692290.2012.734254
Aid for trade flows appear to have had a statistically significant impact in reducing the time of exporting and importing in Sub Saharan Africa.	Cirera, X., and Winters, L.A., (2015), *Aid for Trade and Structural Transformation in Sub-Saharan Africa*, Commonwealth Trade Policy Discussion Papers 2015/01, Commonwealth Secretariat, https://doi.org/10.14217/5js6b1lp69ms-en
Aid for trade increases recipient exports to donors as well as recipient imports from donors. The first effect tends to dominate the latter, which contradicts the sceptical view that donors grant aid for trade primarily to promote their own export interests**.**	Hühne, P., Meyer, B., and Nunnenkamp, P., (2014), *Who benefits from aid for trade? Comparing the effects on recipient versus donor exports*, The Journal of Development Studies, 50(9), pages 1275-1288, https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2014.903246

Table 2.3. Empirical findings on the impact of aid for trade

A positive and significant effect of Aid for trade on multiple measures of export performance, however, with diminishing returns.	Ghimire S., Mukherjee D., Alvi E., (2016), *Aid-for-Trade and Export Performance of Developing Countries*, Applied Econometrics and International Development, Vol. 16-1, http://www.usc.es/economet/journals1/aeid/aeid1613.pdf
Aid for trade increases bilateral greenfield investment and aid for trade for infrastructure and productive capacity are strongly associated with investment.	Lee, H. H., and Ries, J., (2016), *Aid for Trade and Greenfield Investment*, World Development, Volume 84, 206-218, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X15301637
Aid for trade has a robust and positive effect on poverty reduction; the impact is largest in LDCs but the effect differs across countries	Durowah, O., (2017), *The role of aid for trade and foreign direct investment in poverty reduction: a panel data analysis of 91 developing countries*, South Dakota State University, http://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/1187
Aid for trade can play a supportive role in improving the policy environment and help attract the FDI required to meet the SDGs and develop the ICT infrastructure.	Roy, M., (2017), *The contribution of services trade policies to connectivity in the context of aid for trade*, World Trade Organization, https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/reser_e/ersd201712_e.pdf
Countries that export less in volume are those benefitting most from aid for trade.	Martínez Zarzoso, I., Nowak Lehmann, D. F., and Rehwald, K., (2017), *Is aid for trade effective? A panel quantile regression approach*, Review of Development Economics, 2017; 21:e175–e203, https://doi.org/10.1111/rode.12322
Aid for trade has a significant and substantive effect in promoting FDI inflows to recipient countries.	Lee, S., (2018), *An empirical analysis of the effects of aid for trade on foreign direct investment*, Seoul National University - Graduate School of International Studies, http://s-space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/141690/1/000000150680.pdf
Aid for trade has a positive and significant effect on total (male and female) employment, as well as on female employment share, but no significant effect on male employment share.	Kimm Gnangnon, S., (2018), *Aid for Trade and Employment in Developing Countries: An Empirical Evidence*, Labour – Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations, Volume 33, Issue 1, https://doi.org/10.1111/labr.12139
Aid for trade inflows exert a positive and significant impact on recipient countries' export ratios	Kimm Gnangnon, S., (2018), *Aid for Trade and Recipient Countries' Export Structure: Does Trade Policy Liberalisation Matter?*, Journal of Economic Theory and Practice, https://doi.org/10.1177/0976747918806361

These empirical findings are corroborated by evaluations from aid-for-trade programmes and projects as well as by the case stories that were submitted in the context of earlier aid-for-trade monitoring exercises (OECD/WTO, 2013, 2015 and 2017). The 2019 monitoring exercise reports positive impacts of aid-for-trade support in improving economic diversification. According to the partner countries, the category in which aid-for-trade finance has delivered most impacts is trade facilitation, followed by agriculture. The top category from the donors' perspective is agriculture (Figure 2.9).

Figure 2.9. Aid for trade impacts




Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952900

Views gathered from the exercise also reveal that the alignment of aid-for-trade support with national or regional priorities is the key factor of success. Sixty-two partner countries stated that the aid for trade they received for economic diversification is aligned with their priorities. Nonetheless, diverging overall priorities between partner and donor remains a constraint to the success of aid for trade, as stated by half of the partner country respondents. Donors largely held the view that weak institutional capacity is a major constraint in successfully delivering aid-for-trade (Figure 2.10). From the perspective of South-South partners, both poor alignment of priorities and lack of national or regional coordination may limit the success of the aid-for-trade support provided.

After having discussed the results and success factors of aid for trade at an aggregate level, the next section will look in more detail at donor support for empowerment through economic diversification.

Figure 2.10. Aid-for-trade success factors



Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952919

EMPOWERMENT THROUGH ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION.

Many developing countries continue to face considerable obstacles in maximising their economic potential. In countries that are succeeding in exploiting competitive opportunities, success can be difficult to replicate at national level. This could create "islands of excellence" with the rest of the economy operating at lower levels of capital and knowledge intensity. Factors that influence economic diversification are manifold and context or geographic specific (as is the case of small islands and landlocked developing economies). Some of the barriers to diversification, such as an underdeveloped private sector or infrastructural deficits, are also part of the constraints that aid for trade aims to tackle. Donor support addressing these two type of barriers is looked at in the next section. Others, such as investments in education and health care, job creation or social protection, are beyond the mandate of the Aid for Trade Initiative. They are discussed in more detail in other parts of this publication.

Table 2.4. My view on economic diversification

"Aid for trade has helped diversify our export portfolio away from copper."– **Zambia**

"*Diversification of production would help us in ensuring sustainable growth.*" – **Kazakhstan**

"*Since long economic diversification has featured among the objectives of our support.*"- **Sweden**

"An improved investment climate, market access and local productive capacities are key factors for successful economic diversification." – **European Union**

"Between 2012-17, the Pacific Seasonal Worker Programme delivered over AUSD 144 million in net income gains to Pacific island countries and Timor-Leste which is important for their economic diversification." – **Australia**

"*Economic diversification is under way but needs to be strengthened with technical and financial support from partners.*" – **UEMOA**

"*The major constraint to economic diversification is inefficiencies in infrastructure, energy and labour as well as government regulations that affect the environment for doing business; thus hindering economic diversification.*" - **EBRD**

"The main constraint to economic diversification is recovery or rebuilding from frequent and severe natural disasters." – **Pacific Island Forum Secretariat**

"*Economic diversification is a key driver of our trade engagement in developing countries, particularly those that are primary commodity dependent and the poorest.*"– **World Bank Group**

"*Support seeks to address is the lack of information by small businesses about market opportunities and trends for future growth.*"- **UNDP**

Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

In my view* by Sigrid Kaag, *Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation, The Netherlands

I believe that improving women's economic opportunities and removing barriers to their participation in regional and international trade is essential to pursuing economic development and achieving fairer and beneficial outcomes for all. This is one of the guiding principles of Dutch policy on foreign trade and development cooperation.

In that light, it is crucial that the work initiated by the Buenos Aires Declaration on gender and women's economic empowerment continues. At the same time, we must remain committed to implementing the Aid for Trade agenda. A key part of that agenda is addressing women's economic empowerment, the gender gap, women's entrepreneurship and creating more jobs for women. And not just more jobs, but better jobs. Women are still more likely than men to experience unfavourable and even dangerous working conditions.

Entrepreneurship can be a promising way for women to make a living, particularly in low and middle-income countries. This also puts them in a position to increase gender equality by creating jobs and hiring more women. But if this is to happen, women entrepreneurs need equal rights and opportunities, including access to financial services and the opportunity to compete in public procurement procedures. The good news is that digital technologies are helping to create these opportunities.

Aid for Trade helps bring new markets within the reach of women entrepreneurs. But it will take more than that alone. Many female traders are disadvantaged by poor literacy and limited knowledge of cross-border trade regulations and procedures. So access to education, knowledge and skills is essential.


Where do I hope we'll be by 2030? I hope to see women economically empowered, in a position to capitalise on their economic potential, and enjoying equal rights and good working conditions. We can only achieve the SDGs if nobody is left behind, and that includes women. We are on the right track, but collective action is needed to boost and upscale our efforts. Let's make it happen!

Diversifying agricultural production

For industrialisation to take off, growth in agricultural productivity is essential. Empirical findings have established that agricultural growth is causally prior to growth in manufacturing and services. Thus, investments in improved agricultural technology will produce increased agricultural productivity that drives a rural growth process. As this structural transformation process proceeds, the agricultural sector start to account for a falling proportion of employment and income (OECD/WTO, 2013). Since the sector plays a pivotal role in rural economies by providing jobs, income and food security, donors are showing renewed interest in providing support to agriculture. After the share of sector allocable ODA for agriculture fell from about 25% in the 1970s to a low of 5.8% in 2004 support to the sector rose to 8.5% in response to the 2007- 8 food crises and now stands at 10% (Figure 2.11). Donor investments in boosting agricultural productivity are most effective in reducing poverty and inequality when they specifically target smallholder farmers and small-scale agriculture. Land reform and ensuring land rights, reinforcing local infrastructure and public services, strengthening ties between urban and rural areas, and supporting farmer organisations are found to be the most effective instruments to that end (IOB, 2018). A large share of partner country respondents (34 respondents) and the majority of the donors (20 respondents) identified agriculture as the sector with most progress in economic diversification due to the aid-for-trade support received since 2006. Looking ahead, both partner countries and donors consider agriculture as the sector in which aid-for-trade support will be most needed.

In Senegal, cabbage is one of the most important agricultural sectors. Yet, cabbage consignments faced rejections at international borders due to toxic pesticide residues. To support local producers in accessing markets, an STDF project (with funding of USD 577,142) helped supply quality inputs, rolled out technical training and support on Good Agricultural Practices, and ran marketing campaigns to promote safe cabbage production. This resulted in an increase in farmer productivity, improved cabbage quality, and more competitive prices. In terms of trade, export volumes increased from 1,900 tonnes in 2008 to 6,000 tonnes in 2014. The project also supported market diversification, as producers gained new market shares in Mauritania, Mali, The Gambia and Guinea-Bissau.

Figure 2.11. ODA committed to building productive capacity 1973-2017



Source: OEC/DAC/CRS

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952938

Table 2.5. My view on the role of agriculture

"Aid-for-trade support for fisheries and agriculture products strengthens domestic and global value chain linkage in the key productive sectors." – **Kiribati**

"To revitalise banana exports, two improved varieties were brought to Samoa in 2016 with the help of the Australia, New Zealand and the WBG, To date, some 2550 boxes have been exported to New Zealand, but it remains a challenge to maintain pest free banana plantations and manage risks associated with natural disasters." - **Samoa** .

"The Traceability Project of the Honey Chain supports small honey producers to export to the EU." – **Guatemala**

"EU support for traceability in the timber industry and coffee production has contributed to the growth of export diversification in the country." – **Democratic Republic of Congo**

"Support to the agricultural sector had benefited the production of honey and a few other agricultural products." – **Yemen**

"Agricultural productivity particularly in vegetable and fruits production has been improved through assistance from the EIF, World Bank and FAO." – **Lesotho**

"The EIF intervention in the cashew sector has substantially increased income for more than 10,000 people, 90% of whom are women. Similarly, 6,679 employees in mango processing units have seen substantial income increase, 80% of them are women." – **Burkina Faso**

"Agriculture alone, while well developed, is insufficient to ensure Guinea's economic development. Industry, fishing and forestry also have important roles to play." – **Guinea**

"The industrial fabric is still in its infancy, despite the many agricultural and forestry resources. These resources are sold or exported largely unprocessed."- **Central African Republic**

"Meeting SPS standard is an area that will require most aid-for-trade support for economic diversification." – **St. Kitts and Nevis**

Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019)

Canada supports improving the productivity of the agribusiness sector in the Philippines. The intermediate outcomes include raised incomes of small-holder farmers, especially women; increased investments in agriculture and the agribusiness sector; as well as reduced compliance and transactions costs. Australia helped 4,121 small-scale farmers in Cambodia gain access to irrigation. This resulted in an additional 28,769 tonnes of rice production and promoted more positive social attitudes towards women as leaders in Farmer Water Users Communities. France financed a project in Haiti to develop agricultural value chains, make the vetiver sector sustainable, diversify producers' incomes, and strengthen the capacities of stakeholders in the fields of water management. Ireland is developing partnerships between the its agri-food sector and African companies to support sustainable growth of the local food industry, build markets for local produce and support mutual trade. Chinese Taipei provides bamboo seeds to businesses in Nicaragua to increase bamboo production and introduces bamboo processing equipment and machinery to increase production efficiency.

Developing a vibrant private sector

Economic diversification is essential for creating sufficient numbers of jobs for men and women. This is especially true for the rural poor and the young that are entering the labour force. The agriculture sector on its own is unable to provide these jobs. Moreover, raised productivity in agriculture means that less and less people are needed. Thus, productive employment opportunities have to be created by expanding the business sector, in both manufacturing and services. Most donors aim to promote inclusive and sustainable growth through their private sector development (PSD) strategies and programmes. During the 1970s, they provided around USD 3 billion in direct support to industry and mining. This covered more than 50% of total support to building productive capacities. Although the volume continued to fluctuate between USD 2 billion and USD 3 billion, the share fell to around 15% in most recent years (Figure2.11).

Table 2.6. My view on the role of developing the private sector

"In terms of economic diversification, there is much potential to develop services" – **Samoa**

ECOWAS *is applying a 'youth lens' to interventions in Private Sector Development through supporting business incubation services, access to finance for young entrepreneurs; and exploring employment through labour-based methods on infrastructure projects to promote youth innovations and inventions.*

Luxembourg *is strengthening vocational training systems and craftsmanship, specifically in ICT and green jobs, aligning them with local labour market needs.*

Denmark *supports the private sector in Ghana through a Business Advocacy Challenge Fund that helps diversify trade and integrate the economy into the multilateral trading system. Initiatives include business licensing and registration, reviews for the ECOWAS Common External Tariff, reducing costs of doing business at the ports, counterfeit and illicit trade, and ratification of the Trade Facilitation Agreement.*

Switzerland's *new private sector strategy has been adjusted and includes more specific measures to improve the living conditions of poor population groups through access to financial services and technologies.*

In 2018, **Sweden** *helped 600 SMEs in Moldova to adopt new technologies, improve product quality, invest in workforce development, provide better working conditions, increase salaries and enhance marketing skills to be able to take full advantage of the Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with the EU.*

Lithuania *implemented a project on strengthening of international trade capacity of Ukrainian SMEs by sharing its experience on international trade.*

Source: OECD-WTO monitoring exercise (2019)

Creating a business enabling environment

Over the last two decades, donors have moved increasingly into supporting developing countries through technical assistance on how to create a business enabling environment and on how to enhance business inclusiveness. This type of donor support started modestly in the mid-1990s with total amounts of around USD 1 billion and almost tripled at the end of the last century. It now stand at USD 2 billion that is 8.5% of total support to building productive capacities (Figure 2.11). There are many common threads in the PSD strategies of different development agencies. All of them promote reforms in the business environment by advising to reduce the burden of regulatory compliance to allow businesses creating employment opportunities for the poor. For example, the United States supports Vietnam through its USD 42 million Country Development Cooperation Strategy to strengthen its legal and regulatory framework in order to promote investment, economic growth and rising incomes. This includes both support for more transparent and participatory public policy processes and assistance to help create economic opportunities, particularly for underrepresented and disadvantaged populations, as well as to advance female empowerment (USAID, 2018).

Table 2.7. My view on the role of a business enabling environment

Strong institutional capacity is key in sustaining donor support for economic diversification. – **Lesotho**

Among the aid for trade success factors is the political will to create an enabling environment. – **Kiribati**

Institutional and human capacity building may have positive impact on domestic and foreign investment in production and productivity development, export promotion, and value chain development. - **Nepal**

SME development can focus on improving the business environment, strengthen their capacities, developing entrepreneurial culture and innovation for both young people and women. – **Côte d'Ivoire**

It is important that institutional capacity and coordination is supported at all levels of women's economic empowerment intervention. - **TradeMark East Africa**

Estonian *support is guided by the principle of strengthening institutional capacities at the country level.*

Luxembourg *is supporting partner countries in creating an enabling environment for enhanced private sector engagement*

The **Russian Federation** *is assisting Belarus in its accession to the WTO through strengthening national and institutional capacity and expertise.*

The **European Union** *supports Côte d'Ivoire in establishing an arbitration court, adjusting national regulations to international legal contexts, designing a fully owned trade policy with a clear identification priority sectors and simplification and transparency of customs procedures in order for Côte d'Ivoire to take advantage of the new Economic Partnership Agreement and its preferences on the EU market.*

Source: OECD-WTO (2019) monitoring exercise

Providing access to finance

Lack of access to finance is a common challenge in trying to diversify the economy and empower the poor. Despite improvements during the last decade, many financial systems of developing countries still suffer from shortcomings and market inefficiencies. This affects their business environment at various levels. There is an absence of instruments and institutions adapted to local business needs, while the cost of credit is often too high for want of competition. This leads to a lack of medium and long-term lending for businesses, while the majority of people lack access to basic formal financial services (Buera, 2011). Whilst recognising the importance of the enabling environment and institutions, some donors consider that direct intervention could be beneficial, provided that precautions are taken to avoid market distortion. The recourse to public-private partnerships (PPPs) can lead to donors and their development financial institutions (DFIs) directly participating in financing an activity or in a guarantee structure for it. In these cases, donors and DFIs act as catalysts to attract private financing. This is considered as an effective way to maximise the leverage of ODA. Donor support for banking and financial services averaged at around USD 1.5 billion up to the 2007-08 financial crises. After credit dried up donors stepped in and doubled their support in 2009. It continued to increased and reached USD 5 billion in 2017. Now almost 22% of all support to building productive capacities is for banking and financial services (Figure 2.11).

Table 2.8. My views on improving access to finance

"*Aid for trade can benefit access to finance for SMEs.*" – **Angola**

"*Emphasis should be placed on women entrepreneurs' access to finance, at attractive rates and less rigid conditions.*" – **Madagascar**

"*Among the factors contributing to the success of aid-for-trade are access to finance.*" - **Iraq**

"*Support should be directed more towards promoting access to finance.*" – **Togo**

"The priority sectors in which we will need financing are direct subsidies to producers, guarantee funds and participation funds to ensure guaranteed access to financing." - **Guinea**

"Aid for trade can contribute to women's economic empowerment in several ways including programs to assist women to access trade finance." – **Kiribati**

"*The* **European Union** *through the Asian Development Bank support MSME access to finance in Samoa, Tonga, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands.*"

"**EBRD** *supports large-volume and long-term trade finance. This also includes supporting the growing 'South-South' trade finance, as well as intra-regional trade with Cyprus, Greece and Turkey.*"

Canada *provides credit and financial services to underserviced populations in Panama, Tanzania, Tunisia, and Zambia.*

Austria *provides loans and equity to financial institutions in partner countries which are fully dedicated for female SMEs.*

Source: OECD-WTO (2019) monitoring exercise

Promoting inclusive tourism

Tourism is an important facilitator of structural transformation in a number of developing countries. As tourism has relatively low entry barriers for labour and low capital requirements, it can provide an alternative livelihood option, especially in rural areas. The growth of labour-intensive services connected to tourism has helped the re-allocation of surplus labour out of agriculture. Creating strong intersectoral linkages is crucial to ensuring a greater capture of tourist expenditures – a key determinant in facilitating the transfer of economic benefits from the sector to local communities. Local procurement of inputs can generate business opportunities for local suppliers with backward linkages creating employment and forward linkages stimulating markets for products or services consumed by tourists. Thus, linkages between tourism and other productive sectors have the potential to stimulate employment and tackle poverty and social exclusion including among women and youth (OECD/UNWTO/WTO, 2013). Direct donor support for tourism is relatively modest at around an annual average of USD 180 million since 2006 (Figure 2.11). Most of this money is used for technical assistance to help design strategies for promoting sustainable tourism and strengthen backward and forward linkages with the local economy. Sixteen partner country respondents and 10 donors identified travel and tourism as a sector in which the aid for trade has been impactful. Forty-eight partner countries stated that aid for trade support to tourism is needed to deliver economic diversification. This view is echoed by 10 donors.

Table 2.9. My views on the role of tourism

"*With donor support, small businesses were able to market their tourism business online, proving that tourism is a worthwhile business to pursue. New knowledge is passed on to local communities, such as the production and provision of local foods to tourists.*" – **Vanuatu**

"*To revive the tourism sector, entry visas have been removed, a new airport was constructed, hotel credits for the financing of tourist accommodation were established as well as Casamance with special tax status for tour operators, integrated tourist areas, and upgrade of accommodation, among others initiatives.*" – **Senegal**

"*Tourism establishments have been star graded to attract more tourists. Moreover, business registration system has been automated to improve ease of doing business in the country.*" – **Lesotho**

"*In the area of travel and tourism; the Africa Visa Openness Index has been particularly successful in promoting visa policy reforms for Intra-Africa travel.*" – **African Development Bank**

"*Economic empowerment indicators or targets listed in the tourism sector includes improving access to credit for small entrepreneurs, establishing tourism small enterprise empowerment fund, providing incentives for small business development in tourism.*" – **St. Kitts and Nevis**

"*The Moldova Competitiveness Project contributed to an increase in tourism by 20% in 2017.*" - **Sweden**

"*Switzerland finances through UN Trade a project in Tanzania to improve livelihoods through a greater adoption of responsible tourism criteria. The project establishes backward linkages to local industries (mainly agribusiness), promotes responsible tourism and private public dialogue. It is part of the tourism components of the Government's Trade Sector Development Programme.*" – **Switzerland**

"*Some countries rely largely on a single sector to generate exports, and therefore these sectors are likely to require support in diversifying in the future. In the Pacific, there are a number of examples including oil extraction, tourism or fisheries.*" – **New Zealand**

Source: OECD-WTO (2019) monitoring exercise

Trade development

The trade development marker for disbursements stood at USD 5.5 billion in 2017, while commitments reached USD 7,9 billion. This marker was introduced to identify those activities in the productive capacity building category that contribute "principally" or "significantly" to the development of trade. In 2017, this was the case for 31% of all support to the private sector and concentrated in the area of business services, agriculture and industry, which together covered more than 75% of all the trade development markers.

Table 2.10. My view on Trade Development

"Finland's development policy is structured around four priority areas. One of them is support to the development and diversification of the developing countries' own economies. That includes trade development, trade facilitation, value chains, trade policy negotiations capacities etc." – **Finland**

"Trade development (business support services, banking and financial services) and legal support of MSMEs are the most important supporters of the economic empowerment of MSMEs." - **Portugal**

"The USAID East Africa Trade and Investment Hub aims to boost trade and investment with - and within - East Africa. It does this by promoting two-way trade with the United States under the African Growth and Opportunity Act, facilitating investment, deepening regional integration and increasing the competitiveness of select agricultural value chains." – **United States**

"The Trade Support Programme in Angola aims to enhance the local capacity to diversify the economy, negotiate and implement multilateral and regional trade agreements, with a particular focus on the SADC Trade Protocol and Angola's participation to the SADC Free Trade Free Trade Area." – **European Union.**

Source: OECD-WTO (2019) monitoring exercise

BUILDING TRADE RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE

Poor infrastructure remains a major bottleneck in developing countries, despite substantial investments in the past. By raising labour productivity and lowering production and transaction costs, economic infrastructure – transport, energy, and ICT– enhances economic activity and so contributes to economic diversification. Investments in infrastructure can also result in empowerment if they are sufficiently focused. Labour mobility in rural areas, for example, can be enhanced by improving the transport and communication infrastructure. Inadequate infrastructure has been identified as the number one constrain limiting the success of aid for trade in promoting economic diversification in LDCs with 23 respondents indicating challenges in this area. It is also the top constraint dampening the success of aid-for-trade in landlocked developing countries. Also 15 donors mention this as their third top challenge.

Improving transport infrastructure

Transport infrastructure affects profitability, levels of output, income, and employment, particularly for small–medium-sized enterprises. It also affects trade costs, which determines international competitiveness. Improved transport, which reduce workers' time spent on non-productive activities, will raise the economic returns to labour. For the same reason, the lack of affordable access to adequate infrastructure is a key factor in determining the nature and persistence of poverty. Thus, investments in transport infrastructure can help to accomplish a transition from jobless growth to labour-intensive growth (Calderón, 2004). Given these clear benefits, donors have invested heavily in assisting developing countries with expanding and improving their transport infrastructure. In 2017, donor support for transport and storage stood at USD 17.7 billion an increase of USD 10 billion since the start of the Aid for Trade Initiative (Figure 2.12).

Table 2.11. My views on trade-related infrastructure

"Limited infrastructure may limit the success of the aid-for-trade support received." – **Liberia**

"Support to trade-related infrastructure improves value chain linkages in key productive sectors hence increasing exports, employment, income and livelihood generation." – **Kiribati**

"Our country is lagging far behind in industrialisation and development of basic infrastructure." – **Democratic Republic of Congo**

"Trade related infrastructure needs are extremely large but resources are very limited." – **Vanuatu**

"Support in trade related infrastructure development would be highly appreciated." – **Nepal**

"The network infrastructure and transport infrastructure has limited to ability of people to venture into other areas of development." – **Papua New Guinea**

"We are reviving a New Silk Road by setting up a "Western Europe – Western China" transportation corridor." – **Kazakhstan**


"A new investment up to UKP 500 million will build essential infrastructure to lay the foundations for new opportunities, in places where businesses previously would not have been able to operate." – **United Kingdom**

"In the context of Tokyo International Conference on African Development, Japan's investment in Africa has focused amongst others on the development of quality infrastructure, amounting to approx. USD 30 billion under public-private partnership."- **Japan**

"The World Bank hosts the Secretariat of the Global Infrastructure Connectivity Alliance, a G20 initiative launched in 2016 to close the gap in the availability of resources related to infrastructure connectivity. It promotes cooperation, knowledge exchange, and meaningful progress in global interconnectivity."- **World Bank**

Source: OECD-WTO (2019) monitoring exercise

Figure 2.12. ODA commitments to trade related infrastructure



Source: OEC/DAC/CRS

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952957

The Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) aims to strengthen economic integration among countries in the Eurasian region. The BRI encompasses a number of transport corridors; the 'belt', which links China to Central and South Asia and onwards to Europe, while the 'road' connects China to Southeast Asia, the Gulf region, East and North Africa and Europa. The project requires significant funding—an estimated USD 8 trillion between 2010 and 2020 alone. The Chinese government has announced several commitments, including a USD 40 billion Silk Road Fund for projects in the Central Asia region (Lehmacher and Padilla, 2015). Baniya (2019) finds that the Initiative increases trade flows among participating countries by up to 4.1%. These effects would be three times larger on average if trade reforms complemented the upgrading in transport infrastructure. Products that use time sensitive inputs and countries that are highly exposed to the new infrastructure and integrated in global value chains have larger trade gains. Among the partner country respondents who identified the Silk Road Fund as an important source of financing for economic diversification are Venezuela, Tonga, Cambodia, and Kazakhstan.

Another transport infrastructure project is development of the Thilawa port and logistic facilities, as well as the Special Economic Zone in Myanmar supported by Japan with a USD 339 million concessional loan. An ex post evaluation of a similar project in Indonesia underscored the need to also build roads peripheral infrastructure in tandem with port facilities. This integrated approach to providing trade-related infrastructure support in Myanmar is similar to that taken in Vietnam. There, Japan recently announced the provision of a USD 95 million concessional loans for the development of a deep-water port near Haiphong, together with supporting hinterland roads and bridge links (OECD/WTO monitoring exercise 2017 case story 161).

Providing reliable electricity

OECD (2013) finds that electricity is a more significant binding constraint than road or air infrastructure. The availability of electricity is less a constraint than its reliability. This finding is supported by firms in developing countries that identified lack of reliable electricity as an important business constraint. Indeed, producers can address the lack of electricity by using generators and this practice is actually widespread. However, their use comes with a substantial cost; the marginal cost of electricity produced by generators is much higher than electricity from the grid, and the capital cost of a generator adds to the total cost of machinery and equipment. Greenstone (2014) highlights that greater access to reliable energy transforms lives and economies in many ways, including: income generation; greater economic diversification; substitution of labour with capital that increases productivity; creation of small businesses and enterprises; facilitation the reallocation of household time (especially by women) from energy provision to improved education; and, access to greater market size due to lower transportation and communication costs.

Table 2.12. My views on the contribution of Energy

"Strong support has been received in the energy sector, which have promoted business and trade connection and the role of Kazakhstan as a trade avenue between Central and South Asia." – **Kazakhstan**

"The improvement in the energy situation has contributed significantly to the resurgence of activity in the secondary sector." – **Senegal**

"Support to the energy sector has also led to private sector investments." – **The Gambia**

"Guinea's electrification must be taken into account to ensure its economic development." - **Guinea**

Source: OECD-WTO (2019) monitoring exercise

Donor support for energy generation and supply reached USD 14,1 billion in 2017 up USD 9 billion since 2006. The average share of aid to energy in country programmable aid was 12% during the last three years (Figure 2.13). An example of such support is the Euro 60 million loan France together with the AfDB and the EIB is providing for the construction of a high voltage line between Nairobi and Mombasa. The project is improving access to a cost effective electricity supply and a reliable network, contributing to the reduction of technical losses and environmental costs.

Unaffordable or unreliable electricity is identified as a constraint for economic diversification in the national or regional development strategy of 27 partner country respondents. Twenty-three of which 9 LDCs, confirmed receiving aid-for-trade financing in energy supply and generation. Furthermore, 19 stated that this donor support had been impactful. Similarly, 12 donors indicated that they provided financing for energy supply and generation, and 10 confirmed this has had an impact on economic diversification. Looking ahead, 44 partner countries, of which 26 LDCs, highlighted the need to further channel aid for trade to this area.

Supporting information and communication technology

The 2017 joint OECD/WTO Aid for Trade at a Glance report addressed in detail how Information and Communication Technologies (ITC) help businesses to become more productive, people to find greater job opportunities, and governments to deliver better services. The report highlighted that ICT lowers the costs of economic and social transactions for firms, individuals and the public sector. It promotes innovation and boost efficiency as existing activities and services become cheaper, quicker and more convenient. ITC also increases inclusion as people gain access to services that were previously out of reach. Donors are helping to attract the private investment that is needed to bridge the digital divide by providing developing countries with technical support and risk-mitigation mechanisms to crowd-in private funds.

Table 2.13. My views on the contribution of ITC

"*It is necessary that appropriate network infrastructure is available and fully accessible to support production and service delivery including e-commerce development and trade facilitation.*" – **Samoa**

"*Future support for economic diversification may focus on cross-border network infrastructure and transport, services, agriculture, industry.*" -**Gabon**

"*Luxembourg will support partner countries in enabling ICT solutions and reliable data as catalysts for innovative and inclusive growth and development.*" – **Luxembourg**

"*Aid for trade should support the ICT sector by harnessing digital technology to simplify and lower the cost of cross-border certification and documentation processes for MSMEs.*" – **Ireland** - **New Zealand**

"*With regard to SMEs finding business partners, it is very important is to spread information on-line, creating different e-platforms that allow exporters to exchange information.*" – **Ukraine**

"*New issues such as e-commerce are emerging and growing in importance.*"- **ECOWAS**

"*Recent debates and increased demands around the implications of digitalisation and automation for structural transformation has increased our attention to these issues.*"- **Sweden**

"*Chinese Taipei provides a loan to the Belize Telemedia Limited to finance its National Broadband Plan for replacing its fixed internet infrastructure with fiber optic network, so as to increase the quality of and access to fixed internet service.*" - **Chinese Taipei**

Source: OECD-WTO (2019) monitoring exercise

Aid commitments for projects in ICT stood at USD 700 million in 2017 (Figure 2.11). They are mostly in the form of technical assistance for regulatory reform. Once the regulatory framework is in place, the private sector is willing to invest in ICT hardware. Donors reported that this area is attracting a growing demand. An example is the Connect Africa Initiative that includes international fibre connectivity, national backbone initiatives, policy and regulation, and E – applications (OECD/WTO 2017 monitoring exercise, case story 16). More than half of the partner country respondents identified inadequate network infrastructure as a constraint to economic diversification, which was highlighted in their national or regional development strategy. Half of the donor respondents consider it as key target areas in their aid-for-trade strategy. Almost two third held the view that their support in this area could make considerable contribution to youth economic empowerment. This view is shared by 50 partner country respondents.

Trade policy support to promote economic diversification

Economic diversification strategies should be based on comparative advantages with tariffs and non-tariff measures structured in a way that supports this process. Thus, tariffs are especially costly on industrial intermediate inputs for which regional production capacity does not exist: reductions of non-tariff trade costs are needed to tackle binding supply-side constraints to industrialisation (UNECA, 2017). Since 2006, donors committed USD 7 billion to help developing countries identify, negotiate and implement trade agreements. An example of this type of support is provided by Sweden to TRALAC, a trade capacity-building organisation in Africa. Through stakeholder consultations, TRALAC engages proactively with the African Continental Free Trade Area process and identified the need to increase services trade capacity and advance thinking about services trade for industrial development in African countries (OECD/WTO (2017) monitoring exercise, case story 81).

Trade related adjustment

Support for trade related adjustment is relatively small at an average of USD 230 million since the start of the Initiative in 2006. This relatively low level of this aid-for-trade category support is partly explained by the reporting of this type of support under other categories. An example of this is the Tourism Development Project in St Vincent and the Grenadines supported by the European Development Fund with USD 6.5 million. The project aimed to improve the competitiveness of the tourism sector and create employment opportunities for rural communities to accommodate the decline in banana production and export. Periodic evaluations revealed increasing job opportunities, improved quality of the country's tourism product and greater linkages between tourism and other economic sectors (OECD/WTO monitoring exercise 2011, case story 264). Efforts to ensure an efficient and competitive trade facilitation framework should also continue to receive attention. These efforts are addressed in more detail in chapter 6.


SUPPORT IN 2017

Aid-for-trade commitments are firm obligations, expressed in writing and backed by the necessary funds, undertaken by an official donor to provide specified assistance to a recipient country or a multilateral organisation. As such, commitments are an expression of the current priorities of the recipient and donor. Commitments are recorded as the full amount of the expected transfer, irrespective of the time required for the completion of disbursements, which in some cases may take many years. The remainder of this section provides an analysis of aid-for-trade commitments up to 2017, the latest year for which detailed information is available. It highlights distribution by sector, region and income; donors; and the financial terms of the support committed.

In 2017, aid-for-trade commitments reached USD 57.7 billion, an increase of USD 6.2 billion in real terms from its 2016 level an additional USD 34.6 billion compared to the 2002-05 baseline average. Trade-related OOF declined by USD 7 billion in 2017 to USD 60.1 billion; still more than four times the 2002-05 baseline average. Aid commitments for

economic infrastructure reached USD 32.8 billion, up 143% compared to the 2002-05 baseline average. In 2017 support to energy generation and supply increased by more than USD 759 million to USD 14.3 billion. Commitments to the information and communications sector also increased by USD 167 million to USD 749 million. Transport and storage support, on the other hand, decreased by USD 514 million and now stands at USD 17.1 billion. OOF for economic infrastructure decreased 15.2% to USD 29.9 billion. Most of this decline is due to reductions in support for energy generation and supply, which dropped by USD 6.7 billion to USD 15.2 billion in 2017 (Figure 2.13 and 2.14).


Figure 2.13. Aid-for-trade commitments by category, USD billion, constant price 2017



Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2018), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 04 April 2019)."

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952976

Figure 2.14. Trade-related OOF commitments by category, USD billion, 2017 constant



Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2018), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 04 April 2019)."

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933952995

Commitments for building productive capacity, at USD 23.4 billion, rose by USD 5.3 billion in real terms from its 2016 level. As in past years, the largest share of support is directed to agriculture, which attracted USD 10.6 billion, and increased USD 1.6 billion compared to 2016. Further increases are noted in banking and financial services, as well as industry, with both up USD 1 billion and fishing up USD 465 million. Support to tourism stands at USD 400 million an increase of 50% from 2016. The trade development marker was introduced to identify those activities in the category of building productive capacity that contribute "principally" or "significantly" to the development of trade. The marker increased from USD 2.6 billion in 2006 to USD 8.1 billion. It now covering almost a quarter of the total amount for building productive capacities. Two-thirds of this is concentrated in the areas of agriculture and business services.

Aid for trade in its narrowest sense of support to trade policy and regulations attracted USD 1.4 billion in 2017, an increase of 42% compared to 2016. Trade policy management and trade facilitation increased by USD 224 million and USD 219 million respectively compared to its 2016 level. Trade-related education declined by USD 11 million. With respect to trade-related OOF, decreases were recorded in both the trade policy and building productive capacity categories. The latter dropped to USD 29,2 USD in 2017 from USD 30,1 in 2016. OOF for trade policy now stand at USD 1.3 billion a decrease by 34%.

In 2017, 38% of all aid-for-trade commitments were destined for Asia, which amounted to USD 22.1 billion, an increase of USD 1 billion compared to 2016. It should be noted, however, that allocations to Asia fluctuate significantly from one year to the other. In general, this is caused by large biennial commitments from Japan and the ADB towards economic infrastructure. Increases were also noted in Africa up USD 2.9 billion from 2016 to USD 21.7 billion and receiving 36.6% of total commitments, while those to Latin America and Oceania increased by USD 940 million and USD 460 million respectively. Commitments to Europe, however, declined by USD 420 million (Figure 2.15). Most of the 2017 trade-related OOF was destined for middle-income countries in Asia (48.3%), Africa (23%), Latin America and the Caribbean (17%), Europe (9%), and Oceania (1.2%) (Figure 2.16).


Regional and global aid-for-trade programmes were allocated USD 5.9 billion in 2017. This is almost a threefold increase compared to the 2002-05 baseline average. Regional aid for trade offers great potential as a catalyst for growth, development and poverty reduction, but projects are often difficult to realise. While regional aid for trade faces many practical implementation challenges, however, experience has shown that associated problems are not insurmountable, but rather require thorough planning, careful project formulation and prioritisation on the part of policy makers (OECD, 2014).

Aid-for-trade commitments to the LDCs increased in 2017 by USD 4.1 billion to reach USD 18.8 billion (32.5% of total commitments). Other low-income countries received USD 80 million. The share of commitments to the low income countries as a whole reached 32.5% of total aid-for-trade flows in 2017. With commitments of up USD 1,9 billion to USD 23,2 billion, the lower middle income countries were the largest aid-for-trade recipients (40.2%), whereas the upper middle income countries saw their commitments drop by USD 1.2 billion to USD 7.3 billion (Figure 2.17). Countries in the middle-income group were by far the largest recipients of trade-related OOF. At USD 50 billion or 83.3% of total commitments, the amount decreased by USD 7 billion from their 2016 levels. OOF to LICs stood USD 6.5 billion up from USD 5.7 billion (Figure 2.18).

In 2017, bilateral providers committed USD 31.7 billion or 55% of total aid for trade. Japan, the largest donor, with commitments of USD 12.5 billion directed most of its funding to Asia mainly for transport, storage and energy sectors in Asia. Other main bilateral contributors are Germany, with USD 5.7 billion, followed by France with USD 3.2 billion and the United States with USD 2.4 billion. Most bilateral donors provide the majority of their support in the form of grants, with the exception of France, Germany, Japan and Korea, which also provide a large share in loans. Multilateral providers also increased their commitments by USD 4.2 billion to USD 26 billion. The World Bank Group and EU Institutions remain the main contributors providing almost two-thirds of total multilateral aid for trade. Multilateral institutions were the largest contributors of trade-related OOF providing USD 50 billion or 83% of the total. Main contributions are the Asian Development Bank, EBRD, the IFC and the World Bank group.

In 2017, the share of aid for trade in sector allocable aid increased from an average of 30.3% during the baseline period to 39.2% in 2017. Thus, within the expanding ODA budget envelope the share of aid for trade has increased even more. The 9-percentage point increase, which translates into an extra USD 75 billion in commitments since 2006 could be considered as additional aid for trade; three quarters of this increase is provided by the European Union, Germany, France, Japan and the AfDB.


Figure 2.15. Aid-for-trade commitments by region, USD billion, 2017 constant



Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2018), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 04 April 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953014


Figure 2.16. Trade-related OOF commitments by region, USD billion, 2017 constant



Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2017), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 04 April 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953033


Figure 2.17. Aid-for-trade commitments by income group, USD billion, 2017 constant



Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2018), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 04 April 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953052

Figure 2.18. Trade-related OOF commitments by income group, USD billion, 2017 constant



Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019), DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed 04 April 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953071

REFERENCES

Baniya S., Rocha N., and Ruta M., (2019), *Trade Effects of the New Silk Road: A Gravity Analysis*, Policy Research Working Paper, https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-8694

Bayraktar, N., (2018), *Effectiveness of public investment on growth in sub-Saharan Africa*, Eurasian Economic Review, No. 86, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40822-018-0119-z

Buera, F. J., Kaboski, J. P., & Shin, Y., (2011), *Finance and development: A tale of two sectors*, American Economic Review, 101(5), 1964-2002, https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.101.5.1964

Benn, J., C. Sangaré and T. Hos (2017), "Amounts Mobilised from the Private Sector by Official Development Finance Interventions: Guarantees, syndicated loans, shares in collective investment vehicles, direct investment in companies, credit lines", OECD Development Co-operation Working Papers, No. 36, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/8135abde-en.

Calderón, C., and Servén, L., (2004), *The Effects of Infrastructure Development on Growth and Income Distribution*, Policy Research Working Paper, https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-3400

Donor Committee on Enterprise Development (2016), *How to create an enabling environment for inclusive business? Learning from experience and debates in private sector developmen*t, https://www.enterprise-development.org/wp-content/uploads/DCED_Creating_An_Enabling_Environment_For_Inclusive_Business.pdf

Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (2019), *Responsible and Inclusive Business Hubs*, https://www.giz.de/en/worldwide/43855.html

Greenstone, G., (2014), *Energy, growth and development,* International Growth Centre, https://www.theigc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/IGCEvidencePaperEnergy.pdf

International Finance Corporation, *Global Trade Finance*, https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/industry_ext_content/ifc_external_corporate_site/financial+institutions/priorities/global+trade/gtsf2

internationaal oinderzoek and beliedsevaluatie (IOB) (2018), *Transition and inclusive development in Sub-Saharan Africa: An analysis of poverty and inequality in the context of transition*, IOB Study, No. 422 https://english.iob-evaluatie.nl/publications/publications/2018/04/01/422-%E2%80%93-iob-%E2%80%93-an-analysis-of-poverty-and-inequality-in-the-context-of-transition-%E2%80%93-transition-and-inclusive-development-in-sub-saharan-africa

Lammersen F., and Hynes W. (2019 *How trade and aid can help deliver sustainable development goals*, Turkish Policy Quarterly, Volume 17 Number 4 http://turkishpolicy.com/article/944/how-trade-and-aid-can-help-deliver-sustainable-development-goals

Lehmacher, W., and Padilla, V., (2015), *What can the New Silk Road do for global trade*, Financial Times, World Economic Forum, Geneva, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/09/what-can-the-new-silk-road-do-for-global-trade/

OECD (2013a), *Perspectives on Global Development 2013: Industrial Policies in a Changing World*, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/persp_glob_dev-2013-en

OECD (2013b), *Succeeding with Trade Reforms: The Role of Aid for Trade*, The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264201200-en

OECD (2014), *Regional Perspectives on Aid for Trade,* The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264216037-en.

OECD (2016), *Private Sector Engagement for Sustainable Development: Lessons from the DAC*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264266889-en

OECD (2018), Private Philanthropy for Development, The Development Dimension, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264085190-en.

OECD and WTO (2013), *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2013: Connecting to Value Chains*, WTO, Geneva/OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/aid_glance-2013-en

OECD and WTO (2015), *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2015: Reducing Trade Costs for Inclusive, Sustainable Growth*, WTO, Geneva/OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/aid_glance-2015-en

OECD and WTO (2017), *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2017: Promoting Trade, Inclusiveness and Connectivity for Sustainable Development*, WTO, Geneva/OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/aid_glance-2017-en

OECD, UNWTO and WTO (2013), *Aid for Trade and Value Chains in Tourism*, OECD Publishing, Paris/ UNWTO Publishing, Madrid/WTO Publishing, Geneva, https://www.oecd.org/dac/aft/AidforTrade_SectorStudy_Tourism.pdf

OECD and WTO (2013), *Aid for Trade and Value Chains in Agrifood*, OECD Publishing, Paris/WTO Publishing, Geneva, https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/devel_e/a4t_e/global_review13prog_e/tourism_28june.pdf

G20 (2015), *G20 Inclusive Business Framework*, G20 Development Working Group – Turkish Presidency, https://www.inclusivebusiness.net/sites/default/files/inline-files/G20%2BInclusive%2BBusiness%2BFramework_Final.pdf

USAID (2018), *Governance for Inclusive Growth*, https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1861/FS_GovernanceforInclusiveGrowth_Nov2018_Eng.pdf

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (2017), *Transforming African economies through smart trade and industrial policy*, Economic Commission for Africa – Publications Section, Ethiopia, https://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/PublicationFiles/transforming-african-economies_smart-trade_industrial-policy_eng.pdf

CHAPTER 3

PROMOTING ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION THROUGH INDUSTRIALISATION

Contributed by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization


Abstract: *This chapter analyses production capabilities – an essential component for the Aid for Trade Initiative to be effective. Past growth in manufacturing and related services sectors has absorbed large numbers of workers into productive jobs and increased the prosperity of their families and communities. Industrialisation and structural transformation remain at the core of many national and regional economic development strategies. In view of greater automation and digitisation, this chapter also discusses the implications of the changing nature of industrialisation and the production process for the future of manufacturing development. Policy lessons are drawn to address "supply side constraints" in manufacturing through aid for trade, which in turn contributes to structural transformation. One theme that re-emerges throughout the chapter is the opportunities industrial policy offers for inclusive and sustainable development. Relevant environmental aspects, like green technologies and energy efficiency, are also considered in the context of economic competitiveness and sustained growth.*

INTRODUCTION

The manufacturing sector and the process of industrialisation are the key drivers of growth and poverty reduction. As Figure 3.1 illustrates, a positive relationship exists between the growth of manufacturing value added[1] (MVA) and of gross domestic product (GDP). Higher productivity growth in the manufacturing sector makes it an important factor for developing countries to shift activities from agriculture and low productivity services towards manufacturing to achieve growth-enhancing structural transformation (Figure 3.2). In countries that have successfully industrialised, the growth in manufacturing and related services sectors has led to the absorption of large numbers of workers from the agriculture and informal sectors into productive jobs, and has increased the prosperity of those workers' families and communities (UNIDO 2013).

Thus, industrialisation and structural transformation remain at the core of many national and regional economic development strategies, and the United Nations has acknowledged this in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation.

Figure 3.1. Relationship between GDP growth and manufacturing growth, 1970-2017




All values are in constant 2010 USD

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953090

Source: UNIDO elaboration based on the National Accounts Main Aggregates Database (2019), by the United Nations Statistics Division. Based on the importance of the manufacturing sector, this chapter explores the processes behind industrialisation and how sustainable and inclusive economic development can be achieved through the development of this sector. Moreover, in view of the emergence of new technologies, the chapter also discusses the implications of the changing nature of industrialisation and production processes for the future of manufacturing development. For example, greater automation and digitisation may create uncertainty about future paths of development. This chapter demonstrates that latent uncertainty arising from the new emerging paradigm can be transformed into an opportunity for countries across all development stages. Additionally, the chapter draws policy lessons to address supply side constraints in manufacturing through aid for trade, which in turn contributes to structural transformation and economic prosperity. One topic that is discussed throughout the chapter is the opportunities industrial policy offers for inclusive and sustainable development. Relevant environmental aspects, like green technologies and energy efficiency as part of a sustainable growth strategy are also considered in the context of the expansion of the manufacturing sector.

Figure 3.2. Labour productivity growth index: Developing economies



Source: UNIDO's elaboration based on the National Accounts Main Aggregates Database (2019), by the United Nations Statistics Division, and International Labour Organization, ILO modelled estimates (2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953109

The second section below presents the fundamental concepts of industrialisation and its key sources for inclusive and sustainable development. It explores how industrial diversification affects areas of trade. This leads to issues such as employment generation, environmental aspects of industrialisation and the question of constraints and opportunities for developing countries. The third section focuses on the window of opportunities that the changing nature of industrialisation and the new emerging technological paradigm, like automation, offer. The final section concludes.


INDUSTRIALISATION FOR ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION

The perception that manufacturing serves as an engine of growth can be traced back to Nikolas Kaldor's (1966, 1967) growth laws and still applies today, as recent studies suggest (UNIDO, 2015). The growth of manufacturing value added has been identified as a major source of poverty reduction in many developing and emerging industrial economies. This section provides an overview of industrialisation and the driving forces of economic prosperity. Developing countries at a low-income stage in particular can still rely on manufacturing as an engine of growth through the creation of employment opportunities in a more productive sector compared to agricultural activities. The income generated by industrial activities is generally higher than that produced in the primary sector, i.e. the process of industrialisation is expected to bring about an overall increase in income.

A glance at the global development of manufacturing value added reveals an increasing trend (Figure 3.3). Developing countries in particular seem to have experienced high and persistent MVA growth rates since 1990, illustrating the opportunities the manufacturing sector can create.

The long-term pattern of manufacturing development and diversification can be identified by changes in the value added and employment of different subsectors over the course of economic development (Haraguchi, 2019). By inspecting empirical key facts, some important factors become apparent: on the one hand, there is an empirical correlation between per capita income and the degree of industrialisation in developing countries while, by contrast, high-income countries are showing a pattern of deindustrialisation (UNIDO, 2015). The nature of industrialisation provides an explanation for this pattern. Through the expansion of the manufacturing sector, surplus labour from the agricultural sector is absorbed, which increases the productivity of the entire economy due to the expansion of more productive sectors. Simultaneously, the agricultural sector also experiences an increase in productivity (Lewis, 1954).

Figure 3.3. An increasing trend in global manufacturing value added, 1990-2017



Source: UNIDO elaboration based on Manufacturing Value Added 2019 database.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953128

The manufacturing sector clearly provides key elements, which makes it an important driver for economic prosperity through higher productivity and a higher growth rate of productivity than the agricultural sector (Szirmai, 2012). The advantages can be realised through physical capital accumulation and by exploiting economies-of-scale effects. Moreover, technological change through innovations and human capital accumulation through industrialisation act as key drivers for overall economic growth. Finally, as the income of economies increases, the share of income spent on agricultural goods tends to decrease, which shifts aggregate expenditures more on manufactured goods. This opens an opportunity for participation in world markets as demand for manufactured goods diversifies, leading to the need for higher production capacities. This development allows meeting not only domestic demand but newly created foreign demand as well.

While the manufacturing sector in general plays an important role in the economic development of developing countries, contributions of individual manufacturing industries to development vary depending on the stage of economic development. Labour-intensive industries, like food and beverages, textiles and wearing apparel, often exhibit fast growth and account for a major share of manufacturing value added and employment in an early stage of development. As resource intensive industries, such as coke and refined petroleum, paper and basic and fabricated metal-based industries, emerge in a middle-income stage, manufacturing value added in the economy tends to increase further. At a high-income level, motor vehicles, machinery and equipment, electrical machinery and chemical industries usually account for the largest contribution to the growth of manufacturing value added. The increases in both technological development and productivity are the major drivers for the sustained growth of these industries, hence following a path of skill-biased development (Haraguchi, 2016).

Why industrialisation is important and how it promotes diversification and structural transformation


Both the supply and demand sides influence the above-mentioned pattern of structural transformation within the manufacturing sector. For the supply side, technological and skill development are the two major enablers for building and expanding production capacities. This is linked with technological change and increasing productivity within specific industries. Innovations are thus an important factor for sustainable development. Productivity growth and economy-of-scale effects highly depend on product and process innovations. A more efficient production process enables higher

output with less input factors, leading to an overall increase in output and higher capacity. However, innovations rely on access to a skilled and well-educated labour force, i.e. the skill formation process is of particular importance. In addition, specific elements such as infrastructure, the investment or business climate are essential factors for increasing the supply capacity of manufacturing. Without a reliable set of conditions (for instance, access to basic infrastructure), the development of capacities is limited. These issues were frequently raised by partner and donor countries in the OECD-WTO Aid for Trade Global Review Monitoring Exercise (2019) when asked about constraints to economic diversification and successful industrialisation. Thus, adequate measures to ease these constraints are crucial for industrial development and discussed in the following sections.

With the right set of conditions, employment opportunities in the manufacturing sector may increase through the shift from agricultural to manufacturing activities and the services sector. This process of structural change absorbs low productive surplus labour from the primary sector providing access to better pay jobs. Consequently, the economy's overall productivity grows. Due to increased employment in a sector in which the relative wages are higher compared to the agricultural sector, the country's aggregate disposable income rises. The increasing household income and the lower prices of manufactured goods as a result of higher productivity thus have an impact on the demand structure for manufactured goods. A closer look at consumers' perspective of industrialisation is warranted to shed light on the driving forces behind those structures.

Manufactured goods can generally be classified into necessities (food and beverages and wearing apparel/ textiles) and more sophisticated consumer goods, like cars and electrical equipment. An income shift thus starts a virtuous circle of manufacturing consumption and industrial development, illustrated in Figure 3.4 (UNIDO, 2017b). It shows that under certain conditions, feedback loops and distinct effects on income and demand aspects may interact in different stages of the circle, setting it in motion.

Figure 3.4. The virtuous circle of manufacturing consumption: The global economy



Source: UNIDO (2017b).

The different stages of the virtuous circle of manufacturing consumption will be explained from the supply side perspective. Through the industrialisation process and its positive effects on employment, discretionary income (the share of a household's income that can be allocated to goods other than necessities) rises. This is primarily the outcome of better pay and more productive jobs in the manufacturing sector. Eventually, a higher discretionary income yields a diversified demand for manufactured goods, as demand and consequently expenditure shifts away from agricultural products towards manufactured goods. This new demand, in turn, leads to the creation of new industries and new varieties of products in the economy (process of diversification), which is a key component of sustainable long-term economic development (Saviotti and Pyka, 2004). Demand for new products as well as the desire of firms to become more profitable triggers a process of diversification and consolidation within the manufacturing sector. This can be achieved through innovations that make production processes more efficient and increase the quality standards of the produced goods. On the other hand, economies-of-scale effects do not only increases firms' profits but also have significant effects on the price of goods. As a result, the price of goods will drop, meaning more people can afford to purchase them. Eventually, the demand for such goods rises, inducing firms to produce larger quantities of the goods if sufficiently high capacities are available. Reaching a certain level of competitiveness could foster specialisation and the acquisition of skills through the massification of manufacturing demand. Thus, a large part of mass consumption is linked to an increase in productivity (Matsuyama, 2002; Foellmi et al., 2014). In the last stage of the circle of manufacturing consumption, the decline in the price of goods through an amplified technological progress is essential. These effects lead to a further increase in the purchasing power of all consumers, thus boosting the discretionary income even further, which feeds into the start of a new virtuous cycle (DeLong, 2000; Jong, 2015).

To summarise, three factors create the positive effects of the virtuous circle that eventually lead to an increase in household income. First, the demand for new goods (*variety* effect) through affordability and availability grows. Second, the massification process significantly increases the produced and consumed *volume* of the respective goods. Finally, the rise in productivity reduces *prices* and therefore increases discretionary income.

In addition to income creation and massification, the increase in product quality in combination with a simultaneous decrease in relative prices plays a substantial role in boosting consumer welfare and is thus an important contributor to sustainable development. New better quality products reduce living costs and increase people's living standards (Jong, 2015). An expansion of consumption opportunities enables consumers to adapt their preferences; they may ultimately want to consume goods that help them enhance their quality of life (Nussbaum, 1992; Sen, 2001). Moreover, the process of specialisation and diversification may also fuel a process of new regulations, standards and norms, which additionally strengthen consumers' power and wellbeing.

This view of manufacturing consumption gives rise to a discussion on gender aspects. According to Sen (1990) and the World Bank (2012), the presence of gender disparities in every aspect of life represents a major threat to human and economic development.[2] Through a variety of external effects, industrialisation and structural transformation can help promote gender equality in several areas of life. The first effect concerns household work and child rearing, activities that are primarily carried out by women. Such work is unpaid, consumes a lot of the women's daily discretionary time, and significantly reduces their power of having a voice in the political sphere (Kabeer, 1999). Industrialisation and the subsequent affordability of improved household technologies facilitate women's entry into the labour market, thus opening up new opportunities in favour of inclusive development (Becker, 1965; Woersdorfer, 2017). Studies suggest that technological progress may account for over half of the observed rise in the labour force participation rate of females in the US between 1900 and 1980 (Greenwood et al., 2005). Developing and emerging countries with a low labour force participation rate of females can benefit from this.

The fundamental mechanisms and concepts elaborated above foster industrial development as a major driver of economic diversification based on the interplay between supply and demand factors. The process of structural transformation can be intensified through the process of diversification, massification and decreasing prices. Better pay jobs provided by the industrial sector increase workers' disposable income, modifying common demand patterns. Higher aggregated consumption leads to an increase in the economy's income. Having a higher disposable income gives rise to new demand as the expenditure pattern for manufactured goods shifts towards more sophisticated goods. Hence, firms have an incentive to continuously enhance their production capabilities and innovate in order to diversify their product range (UNIDO, 2017b).

Structural change and development


The previous section has shown that the interplay between supply and demand factors shape the process of structural transformation. Specialisation and diversification are key consequences of those processes that affect the manufacturing sector's entire structure. Structural change has significant impacts on the economy's development and thus offers possibilities to influence the future to be more inclusive and sustainable. This subsection discusses the impacts of this transformation on international trade, labour markets, and environmental sustainability. Finally, the limitations and opportunities for developing countries will be highlighted.

Industrial diversification and impact on trade

Figure 3.5 presents the market share of manufactured goods in global export markets between 1988 and 2017. While the share of industrial countries in global export markets declined during this period, emerging industrial economies in particular increased their share. To some extent, least developed countries were also successful in expanding their share of manufactured goods in global export markets over the past decade. This increased participation in global markets has strong implications for industrial diversification and thus serves as a driver of sustainable economic development.

The previously introduced virtuous circle does not only depend on domestic but also in particular on global factors. The key elements are economic stability and growth, supportive trade regulations and a sufficient domestic capacity of the manufacturing sector. Restricted access to global markets through trade barriers limits the opportunity for productivity increases and expansion of the manufacturing sector. While limited access to global markets prevents the implementation of new technologies due to lack of access to innovations, trade barriers hamper the creation of demand for new products. Sustained industrialisation is not possible without trade. While domestic demand provides the initial momentum for the circle to turn and to thus jumpstart the economies-of-scale and the rise in productivity, the sustainable growth of manufacturing industries requires access to foreign markets and technologies. This access helps boost demand and productivity spillovers considerably (UNIDO, 2017b). Specifically, developing countries can use spatial industrial policies to support the upscaling of their industrial capabilities, which may help them target global markets. Small low-income countries, in particular, often cannot rely only on domestic demand and supply of inputs and human capital; hence, regional policies and a focus on regional integration may pay off in terms of developing a sustainable industrial sector by enabling access to larger markets (UNIDO, 2009). Box 3.1 illustrates an example of UNIDO's support for trade facilitation and regional integration through the establishment and capacity development of a regional accreditation body.

Figure 3.5. Share of manufactured goods in global export markets



Source: UNIDO elaboration based on UN Comtrade (2018).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953147

Associated with an increase in demand, the penetration into new markets has a strong impact on the manufacturing sector's development by stimulating export. While low-tech industries such as food and beverages might only involve a limited number of stages of production in the value chain, medium- or high-tech industries (like automotive or machinery) often entail a high number of value adding activities for the production of the final good. Therefore, both building a global production network and establishing a global supply chain network should be an essential part of the national strategy for the development of technology-intensive industries (UNIDO, 2017b). Integration into a global production network by focusing on specific tasks, including final assembly, is advantageous for low-income countries, in particular, which are likely to be suppliers in the global value chain.

Another positive aspect of industrialisation related to exports is a country's balance-of-payments. Having sufficient production capabilities reduces dependence on imports as domestic demand can be met with local goods. Moreover, the production of high quality and competitively priced goods could increase sales in foreign markets, thus improving the country's trade balance.

Box 3.1. Arab region: setting up regional accreditation to overcome technical barriers to trade and promote regional integration

As of 2010, the Arab region was the only region in the world lacking a regional structure for accreditation of conformity assessment services (testing, certification, inspection). Against this backdrop, the Arab Industrial Development and Mining Organization (AIDMO), supported by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), helped establish the Arab Accreditation Cooperation (ARAC) as a platform upon which Arab countries can build and develop their accreditation infrastructure.

By means of support from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida)-funded project, ARAC now follows international best practices and Arab states can receive support from their own regional body locally and no longer have to seek recognition from outside the region. ARAC has reached important milestones over the past years, with 17 countries joining the Agency and significant steps being taken towards international recognition and sustainability.

As a result of the intensive and comprehensive work of the ARAC members, supported by their partners, the ARAC Multilateral Recognition Arrangements (MLA) were internationally recognised in 2017 by the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) and the International Accreditation Forum (IAF). Based on the international recognition of the ARAC MLA, the testing, certification and inspection reports issued under an ARAC MLA signatory are recognised globally as well by all signatories to the ILAC and IAF agreements. In other words, the ARAC MLA operates as an international passport to trade.

Building on the achievements realised to date, efforts will continue until 2020 under the AIDMO-UNIDO-Sida project to support ARAC in becoming a sustainable and effective key driving force for regional trade integration.

Source: OECD-WTO Aid for Trade Global Review Monitoring Exercise (2019).

Trade liberalisation furthermore fosters foreign direct investment (FDI) in developing countries (UNCTAD, 2013). The inflow of FDI often brings capital, skills and managerial know-how to developing countries and provides opportunities to local firms to supply products and services to FDI firms. This encourages greater integration of host countries into global value chains and provides them increased access to foreign markets (UNCTAD, 2013).

Using the positive effects of trade liberalisation, the trend of high-income countries offshoring labour-intensive processes to developing countries opens an opportunity to establish an export-oriented manufacturing sector (UNIDO, 2017b). During the early stages of industrialisation, developing countries usually have a comparative advantage in labour-intensive industries, because production costs in high-income countries are much higher meaning such industries are less profitable. This results in geographically dispersed trade through global production networks opening the opportunity for low-income countries to use their comparative advantage in labour-intensive value chains to enter these networks at different stages, including final assembly.

International trade effects directly and indirectly drive the relative price of manufactured products. The volatility of import prices and the increased availability of intermediate inputs may have a direct impact on the relative prices of manufactured goods. Opening up for trade is usually associated with an increase in competition, often resulting in a decrease in the relative prices of manufactured products (Pain et al., 2008). This in turn fuels the virtuous circle. While diversification, which is triggered by new demand, can be cultivated by global demand, the development of capabilities to produce a diverse range of manufactured products is also crucial. A number of studies has found that the variety effect dominates the price effect in terms of export share gains. Developing countries in particular can expand this share by offering a variety of products instead of decreasing the prices of the products (see, for example, Eicher and Kuenzel, 2016).


Newly created export capacities also foster inclusive industrialisation. Successes in the development of labour-intensive industries and in the export of their products can generate substantial manufacturing employment in low- and middle-income countries (Chataway et al., 2014). Women in these countries may have little access to formal employment and are thus not part of the productive labour force. An increase in labour demand due to industrialisation and the shift from informal or low productivity jobs in the agricultural sector towards better pay jobs in the manufacturing sector offer new opportunities particularly for women. Overall, the income inequality between men and women is expected to decrease through industrialisation.

Expanding manufacturing activities through global market participation has significant effects on domestic structures, including the labour market, wages and employment conditions. The following section takes a closer look at the employment generation opportunities initiated by the process of structural transformation.

Employment generation

Employment growth, among other factors, is important for economic growth. While a substantial decline in the share of manufacturing employment in total employment has been observed in developed countries, developing countries as a whole have witnessed a persistent increase in their share since 1970 (Figure 3.6). Most advanced countries experience deindustrialisation as part of a normal pattern of structural transformation while the manufacturing sector provides more opportunities for employment generation in developing countries (UNIDO, 2017a).

Figure 3.6. Manufacturing employment shares by development group




Source: UNIDO elaboration based on Haraguchi et al. (2017) and International Labour Organization, ILO modelled estimates (2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953166

According to UNIDO (2017a), specific industries offer different opportunities for employment generation across different income stages. For instance, manufacturing industries related to the production of basic necessities, like food and beverages and textiles, usually have a higher development potential at an early stage of industrial development for three reasons. First, these industries do not require high levels of technologies and skills; therefore, entry into such industries is easier. Second, even in low- and middle-income countries, demand for these consumption goods is high because they satisfy fundamental human needs. Third, the existence of preferential market access schemes (a generalised system of preferences and duty-free, quota-free access for least developed countries) provide ready access to large consumer markets if rules of origin and other non-tariff measures can be successfully navigated. Thus, demand for these goods encourages developing countries to enter and expand low-tech industries.

Figure 3.7. Average manufacturing-induced employment by country group



Source: UNIDO based on Word Input Output Database 2016 from Timmer, M. P., et al. (2015).

The major sources of employment are the food and beverages, textiles and the wearing apparel industries (UNIDO, 2017a). These industries build a solid foundation for the future growth of the manufacturing sector by creating formal employment opportunities, generating demand for the products and services through backward linkages and contributing to income growth, better education and infrastructure in an early stage of development. However, because these developments coincide with the country's income growth, production costs will eventually increase. As a result, the growth of early stage industries ultimately reaches its peak, as the main source of the industries' growth derives from cost competitiveness. Consequently, as incomes increase, capital- and technology-intensive industries, which play a pivotal role for long-term employment growth, must be established to avoid the so-called middle-income trap where countries are not able to compete with low-wage industries in low-income countries or high-technology industries in high-income countries (UNIDO, 2017a). However, demand for goods from these industries hinges on a higher level of disposable household income, which in turn depends on labour market participation and the availability of better pay jobs.

In addition to direct employment opportunities, the manufacturing sector fuels employment in the remaining sectors through intersectoral linkages (Figure 3.7).

The figures display the dependence of other sectors' employment on the food, beverages and tobacco industries (left panel) and the motor vehicle production industries (right panel) between 2000 and 2014 in advanced, emerging and transitional countries, respectively. The food and beverage producing subsector, for example, highly depends on agricultural supply and thus exhibits a strong backward linkage to the primary sector in terms of employment (green bar). In emerging and transition countries, in particular, the expansion of this manufacturing subsector may thus not only absorb jobs but also generate jobs in the agricultural sector through an intersectoral link. Within the motor vehicle industry, the labour force is predominantly engaged in direct production (blue bar) while the output created from this subsector also creates employment in other supplier industries (yellow bar). The increased volume of final output from this sector also generates employment momentum in the service sector (pink and purple bar). In emerging countries, the service sector may benefit considerably in terms of employment from the expansion of this particular subsector through manufacturing-related services. Thus, the process of 'servicification', where manufacturing-related services gain importance in the industrial sector, creates the necessary demand for a competitive service sector within a given economy (Guerrieri and Meliciani, 2005). Consequently, the implementation of policy measures promoting the industrial sector's development provides for additional employment spillover effects in other sectors. This was especially evident in the OECD-WTO monitoring exercise (2019) where partner countries frequently mentioned the simultaneous expansion of both the industrial and the service sector as an aid-for-trade priority.

Since countries follow a skill-biased technological development as their level of industrialisation progresses, the supply of skilled and trained workers is crucial for diversification. Many countries invest large amounts in human capital formation to provide a sufficient supply of skilled workers. However, formal education is not the only factor that plays a role in the process of human capital accumulation, so is learning-by-doing and on-the-job training. The latter is an efficient and economical way to meet industries' demand for skills and is usually provided to employees after completing their formal education in schools. Reducing unemployment does not only improve household income, it also has substantial effects on the successful implementation of technological upgrading within firms. Productivity depends on the ability of workers to implement and work with new technologies. Thus, the changing needs of industries for workers with a different skill set during the industrialisation process requires the implementation of appropriate measures to ensure workers' availability when needed (UNIDO, 2017b).

In light of promoting inclusive employment opportunities, special attention must be paid to marginalised groups, youth and women. These groups are typically prone to poverty and discrimination by being excluded from the labour market. Youth unemployment, in particular, has strong negative effects on the future of those directly affected and on the economy as a whole. Being unemployed at the beginning of working life generally increases the probability of being unemployed later (UNIDO, 2013). The whole economy may thus benefit from the virtuous circle of manufacturing

consumption if the labour market participation rates of those groups increase. Increasing the level of employment among these groups not only increases their personal income but also increases the economy's overall income through a general rise in aggregated consumption. According to the virtuous circle, the creation of new demand is highly dependent on household's discretionary income, which in turn depends on employment possibilities (UNIDO, 2017b).

Thus, the primary focus for generating employment opportunities should be on increased output and the quality of the manufacturing sector's growth. This development, however, has environmental implications.


Environmental sustainability

Industrialisation and an increase in the manufacturing sector's output has strong positive effects on employment and income generation and contributes to poverty reduction. However, industrialisation and a higher output of manufactured goods is often associated with an increase in harmful greenhouse gas emissions such as CO_2 and an extensive use of natural resources. Managing and reducing these externalities is a key element of sustainable economic development and structural transformation through industrialisation.

Using data from 1995 to 2013, Figure 3.8 presents a decomposition of CO_2 growth rates into the effects of scale, composition and intensity in the manufacturing sector (UNIDO, 2017a). Overall, the rise in emissions in the manufacturing sector increased significantly across all income groups during this period. Upper middle- and lower medium-income countries experienced the highest total growth of CO_2 emissions (purple bar), while the growth rate in high-income country group was fairly negligible.

The decomposition reveals that growth in the volume of the economy (green bar) and slow efficiency growth (blue bar) are the main reasons for the total growth of emissions. A composition effect does not significantly contribute to total growth (orange bar). This disaggregate analysis highlights the heterogeneity across countries in relation to the role of the scale and intensity effects of emissions due to manufacturing activities.

Figure 3.8. Decomposition of CO_2 emissions production from 1995 to 2013




Source: UNIDO (2017a).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953185

Not only the environmental effects and efficiency improvements in the manufacturing sector are highly diverse, so are the trends and improvements (Mazzanti and Nicolli, 2017). For instance, Figure 3.9 reports that the CO_2 emission per unit of real value added of many industries tends to decrease when income rises. The industries rubber and plastic, precision instruments, furniture as well as basic metals and chemicals emit high CO_2 emissions when active in countries at a low stage of development. With a rise in income, countries can reduce the emissions from these industries and

thus undergo a shift to relatively clean industries. However, some industries such as food and beverages and textile and wearing apparel exhibit a fairly robust emission pattern without a significant reduction as income rises. Nevertheless, while manufacturing as a whole tends to improve CO_2 emission intensity, the total growth of emissions could still increase substantially, especially in the middle-income stages due to an increase in output volume (Figure 3.8).

Figure 3.9. Industry-level CO_2 emission per unit of real value added



Source: UNIDO.

Based on the findings of the previous sections, there is an opportunity to veer off the path of environmental trade-off and draw on past lessons to reduce the scale of CO_2 emissions while reducing their intensity in the production process to minimise environmental impacts.

The two major channels for moving towards greater environmental sustainability are the production process and overall production structure (UNIDO, 2015). The production process within a specific firm involves certain stages in which green technology can, for instance, be implemented to reduce negative emissions. Production can be made more efficient to minimise the input of resources. Moreover, the type of energy used in the production process is a crucial factor for reducing the environmental impact of manufacturing activities. Therefore, governments can use instruments like subsidies or taxation schemes to incentivise the transition from fossil fuel-based sources towards renewable energy sources (UNIDO, 2017a). On the other hand, a strong focus on recycling may achieve both effects, i.e. the reduction of emissions and more efficient material use. Recent elaborations on the idea of a circular economy, where product


design incorporates an extended lifespan, highly efficient resource management and a strong focus on recycling in the entire product cycle can help countries move towards a sustainable industrial sector. While firms naturally tend to minimise their input costs, environmental protection might come at a cost and thus exhibit a trade-off pattern. Elements of the circular economy may thus be of great benefit for both consumers and producers (UNIDO, 2017c). Put differently, the industrialisation process and structural change pattern reveals an inverse U-shaped curve for emission intensity.[3] This can be explained by the rise of energy- and resource-intensive industries (such as metals, non-metallic minerals, and chemicals and chemical products) in a middle-income stage and higher environmental productivity through emission-reducing technologies of high-tech manufacturing industries.

Countries can avoid the trade-off pattern of the past and achieve growth based on technological progress and green innovations without sacrificing the environment. This, however, requires knowledge and technology transfer, and sufficiently simple tools for the actual implementation of such technologies in developing countries. UNIDO (2015) sees an opportunity for low-income countries to absorb accessible technology to foster environmentally friendly production processes. When countries diversify into energy-intensive industries, they can benefit from existing technologies and innovations to sidestep the environmental trade-off pattern.

Limitations and opportunities for developing countries

Based on the general patterns of industrial diversification and structural transformation, some implications can be derived to put forward a window of opportunity for developing countries. From the demand perspective, Figure 3.10 illustrates the significance of domestic demand for countries in different stages of development (UNIDO, 2017b). The figure presents the share of domestic absorption in final manufacturing demand over the period 1990 to 2013.

Figure 3.10. Share of domestic absorption in final demand for manufactured goods



Source: UNIDO (2017b).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953204

All country groups heavily rely on domestic demand to sell manufactured goods. Least developed countries have the highest share of domestic absorption in final manufacturing demand while high-income countries have witnessed an increase in foreign demand for their manufactured goods.

Box 3.2. Quality Infrastructure for Trade Facilitation (QI4TF) tool to support market access

Trade facilitation, or rather the smooth flow of goods, relies on the proper operation of the Quality Infrastructure System, especially testing, inspection and certification, to demonstrate a product's compliance with market requirements and its mutual acceptance. UNIDO, with funding from the Government of Germany (BMZ), has developed a Quality Infrastructure for Trade Facilitation (QI4TF) tool to identify gaps in the National Quality Infrastructure System (NQIS) that impede effective implementation of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA).

This diagnostic tool identifies the capabilities and weaknesses that governments and industries are most likely to face when entering the international food market. The objective of QI4TF is to identify and facilitate the prioritisation of the most critical gaps in the NQIS that obstruct trade, whilst complying with the requirements of the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement and Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreement. The tool is intended to be applied to any first-level processed agro-food product passing from one country to another.

The tool has been piloted both in Malawi and South Africa with support from the National Committee on Trade Facilitation (NCTF) and relevant stakeholders. The methodology brought together key public and private sector institutions to identify and prioritise the gaps. The results serve as an input to support national capacity building and technical cooperation to navigate and focus efforts on addressing key needs/gaps.

QI4TF tool can be used by any institution vested with the responsibility of trade facilitation in a given country to carry out a self-assessment and prepare a roadmap for implementation.

Source: UNIDO.

There is a major opportunity to increase product quality and competitiveness through demand-side policies, such as strengthening the safety and quality regulations to move towards international standards. The inability to meet international quality standards has been identified as one of the main constraints to economic diversification by countries, donors and South-South partners in the 2019 aid-for-trade monitoring exercise. A diagnostic tool to identify weaknesses in the quality of infrastructure, such as that developed by UNIDO, could help countries comply with the requirements of the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement and Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) Agreement for trade facilitation (Box 3.2).

Both the supply and demand sides must play their parts to create a virtuous circle for sustained industrialisation. Building supply capacity, producers can compete with imports and meet a large share of domestic demand. The expansion of the manufacturing sector as well as related agricultural and services sectors contribute to a rise in income, which further increases the volume of demand and creates demand for new and more sophisticated products. Changes in consumer behaviour induce firms to upgrade and diversify their product lines. Certain essential components set off this virtuous circle and sustain it. For instance, sound infrastructure and a reliable business environment may serve as an incentive for investments in new capacities. Existing capacities can be expanded if they are not limited by poor transport facilities and an unreliable power supply. To foster such expansions through investments, one precondition is access to finance based on an effective financial system and financial intermediaries. Governments play a special role in supporting such developments. Moreover, high taxes, inflexible regulations and business laws as well as corruption strongly influence investment decisions through the production cost channel (UNIDO, 2013). From a trade policy perspective, developing countries and their trading partners may additionally benefit through bilateral, regional or multilateral opening.

Another opportunity for developing countries to expand their manufacturing capacities is participation in global trade, which involves the foreign demand channel. For instance, UNIDO (2017b) views "[g]lobal demand for domestic manufacturing products [as] a critical vehicle for promoting industrial development and growth". Thus, a capacity expansion of the manufacturing sector fuels the virtuous circle of consumption, ultimately leading to the diversification of manufactured goods. Opening for trade, the domestic economy may have a positive effect on workers' wages and firms' profits through two channels. First, global demand for new product varieties triggers the diversification of manufactured

goods. Second, the increasing demand for existing product varieties leads to a massification of products. However, increased global participation may come at a cost and may limit future economic growth. On the one hand, the substitution of domestic goods with foreign imports leads to a leakage of potential revenues from domestic demand to foreign producers. Furthermore, a decline in global prices of domestic export goods results in a reduction of aggregated income in the domestic economy (UNIDO, 2017b). In general, countries with a high export product concentration (i.e. they only export a limited number of goods) are particularly vulnerable to a volatile global market.

From a more disaggregated perspective, firm-specific issues like technological upgrading, access to supplier networks or overall managerial capacity are important drivers for initiating product line diversification. Good managerial practices and access to reliable market information (domestic and global) are crucial for jumpstarting industrial expansion along the structural transformation path. One precondition for successful technological upgrading within firms and factories is the development of the general skill set of workers. On-the-job training should therefore be part and parcel of firms' efforts to upgrade their workers' skills. For countries that cannot rely on domestic structures to ensure appropriate skill formation, special economic zones (SEZ) where different trade and incentive regimes are established, may provide appropriate support for on-the-job skills in particular (UNIDO, 2009). Thus, policies dedicated to the establishment of such zones can complement the path towards the productive use of new technologies. Among others, supporting the establishment of industrial zones is one of the key features of UNIDO's new Programme for Country Partnership (PCP). This integrated service package generally supports host countries in various ways to accelerate inclusive and sustainable industrial development (Box 3.3). Currently, the priority areas of the PCP implemented in Senegal, Peru, Cambodia and Morocco include the development of such zones to promote sustainable industrial diversification.

Box 3.3. UNIDO's Programme for Country Partnership (PCP)

UNIDO provides a new programmatic service to governments on industry-related issues to deliver a country-tailored programme to support and accelerate inclusive and sustainable industrial development. The PCP identifies the main opportunities and constraints for advanced industrialisation and uses this analysis to design and develop a holistic programme for enhancing the host country's industrial development.

Through the combination of UNIDO's advisory services and multidisciplinary technical assistance, the PCP takes the country's job creation potential, its export opportunities and the ability to attract foreign direct investment into account. Moreover, the PCP facilitates the mobilisation and coordination of public and private investment to support large-scale industrial projects for prioritised industrial sectors.

To ensure synergies among different projects and programmes, various actors such as development partners, financial institutions, the business sector as well as academic and civil entities build a multi-stakeholder partnership under the lead of the host government. UNIDO facilitates the overall coordination of the programme and, depending on the country-specific requirements, supports policy and strategy development, the expansion of industrial zones and eco-industrial parks as well as skills training programmes.

Currently, integrated service packages through the PCP are being implemented in Ethiopia, Senegal, Peru, Cambodia, Kyrgyzstan and Morocco. In 2019, new PCPs will be formulated for Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Rwanda and Zambia.

Source: UNIDO.

For more information, please visit: https://www.unido.org/programme-country-partnership

In other words, if countries can harness industrialisation by addressing both the supply and demand side constraints, a number of unemployed persons or those who work in informal jobs can be absorbed by the manufacturing sector. This sector is thus the engine of growth for transitioning from a low- to a medium-income stage. As regards inclusive development, the emergence of labour-intensive industries in the early stages of industrialisation generates a large number of formal jobs that women and youth can perform. The advantage of formal employment lies in the reduction

of economic risks, resulting in a less volatile income flow as well as access to social insurance (Braunstein, 2019). However, overall female employment in manufacturing industries tends to fall during the transition towards medium- and high-tech industries (UNIDO, 2017a). This could be due to limited access of women to education, which excludes them from acquiring the necessary skills to work in technology-intensive industries. Moreover, gender discrimination may further prevent equally skilled women from employment in such industries.


Braunstein (2019) suggests an inclusive industrial strategy to be guided by three main principles. First, avoid *segregation* of women in the lowest paid (mostly labour-intensive) industries by providing them with access to capital- and technology-intensive jobs. This can be achieved through incentives for firms to employ women or direct support for women to acquire necessary skills. Second, through the provision of sound labour *standards*, which protect women's bargaining power, making gender discrimination less likely. And third, by applying the wage and employment conditions in the industrial sector as a benchmark for *employment in the service sector* which traditionally employs women. Addressing gender issues is indispensable for achieving inclusive industrial development.

As regards environmental aspects in relation to a sustainable future for developing countries, a reduction in both emissions and in material use is part and parcel of an environmentally friendly growth path. It can be expected that developing countries will most likely increase their emission levels along the path of structural transformation, as industrialisation triggers the emergence of emission-intensive industries. This leads to a global imbalance in terms of emissions, as high-income countries assert that the effectiveness of emissions stabilisation policy critically depends on the commitment of developing countries to such policies. Many high-income countries have already implemented the Kyoto Protocol by implementing low-cost emission reduction strategies. As low-income countries in an early stage of industrial development are still at the beginning of establishing their industrial activities, they are key players for reaching a global emission-per capita convergence target. One essential factor for reaching this global goal of emission reduction is technology transfer from developed to developing countries. This can be achieved through specific industrial technologies or environmentally friendly technology transfers, which affects the entire production structure and the individual production processes (Cantore and Padilla, 2010). The recycling of waste and materials, for example, is part of such a green technological process. By transferring the relevant technological innovations and the required knowledge to implement such processes, high-income countries can play a vital role in greening developing countries' industrialisation process (UNIDO, 2015). An additional advantage of such a strategy is the cost factor of input materials. This may serve as another driving force to switch towards more environment friendly technologies. Using input materials more efficiently while simultaneously reducing emissions benefits both the environment and the manufacturing firm in terms of costs (UNIDO, 2017a).

Figure 3.11 below highlights the main constraints to economic diversification that emerged from responses to the joint OECD-WTO study involving both developing country respondents and their financing partners.

Of the 88 developing country respondents to the 2019 aid-for-trade monitoring exercise, 67 (76%) cited limited industrial manufacturing capacity as the biggest constraint to economic diversification identified in their national or regional development strategy. Among donor respondents, however, the same constraint is listed as the top 5th constraint while low levels of training and skills made it to the top of the list of constraints to economic diversification. South-South partners, like donors, identified low levels of training and skills as the leading challenge, followed by an inadequate transport and network infrastructure, limited e-trade readiness, high input and trade costs and lack of standards compliance. Fundamental concepts of industrialisation have been discussed so far in view of inclusive and sustainable industrial development. The emergence of a new technological paradigm may, however, pose new opportunities and challenges. The following section therefore discusses new emerging technologies and their implications for the future of industrial development.

Figure 3.11. Principal constraints to economic diversification




Source: OECD-WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019).

THE CHANGING NATURE OF INDUSTRIALISATION AND PRODUCTION PROCESSES

The key driver for economic diversification and structural transformation is the expansion of the manufacturing sector. Industrialisation provides distinct advantages in terms of value added and employment opportunities compared to the agricultural sector, especially for emerging and developing countries. However, industrialisation is by no means a homogeneous phenomenon and highly depends on country-specific effects (for example, quality of institutions, the regulatory framework or the set of policy measures), resource endowments and the economy's income level.

Figure 3.12 presents the long-term trends in formal manufacturing employment by region for 1970, 1990, 2010 and 2016. While employment in formal manufacturing jobs has mainly decreased in industrialised countries, a relatively strong increase in manufacturing employment can be observed for some developing and emerging regions of the world, i.e. East Asia and the Pacific. There is empirical evidence, for example, that labour-intensive manufacturing activities tend to be concentrated in countries with low labour costs while high-tech industries are more likely to emerge in wealthy countries with access to a high-skilled workforce. This, inter alia, provides an explanation for the changing pattern of manufacturing employment across the world (UNIDO, 2017a).

Figure 3.12. Trends in formal manufacturing employment by region, 1970, 1990, 2010 and 2016




Source: UNIDO elaboration based on INDSTAT2 2019 database (2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953223

This aggregated view illustrates the pattern of changes in manufacturing employment across world regions but does not show the recent trends within certain industries.

To explore the changing nature of industrialisation and production processes, a more disaggregated view of the manufacturing sector is presented in Figure 3.13. It shows the use of industrial robots as part of the recent trend of automation across industries, and indicates that increasing automation within certain industries plays a special role in the transformation of industrial development patterns through technological innovations. Due to their diverse characteristics and distinct production processes, different manufacturing industries exhibit varying degrees of potential automation. The heterogeneity does not only apply within the industrial sector but also across time, as Figure 3.13 reveals (UNIDO, 2017a).

Figure 3.13. Use of industrial robots in different industries



Source: UNCTAD (2017), UNCTAD/TDR/2017, based on National Accounts Main Aggregates Database UNSD (2017).

The majority of installed automation devices are primarily found in three capital-intensive industries: 1) automotive, 2) computer and electronic equipment and 3) electrical equipment, appliances and components. According to UNCTAD (2017), low-tech and labour-intensive industries do not follow an intensive automation path and thus still provide opportunities for employment generation. Insights into the impact of new technologies on production processes within a given industry as well as into the trends of structural transformation across different stages of development are necessary to assess employment opportunities in general.

Autor (2015), for instance, considers workplace automation to be a multidimensional trend that will have heterogeneous effects on future labour market developments. In his view, automation may actually complement labour inputs and create new opportunities for employment, thereby affecting income generation in various ways. However, automation has a limited cost-reducing effect, as certain tasks can simply not be fully automated yet. Thus, labour can only be substituted by machines or robotic devices to a limited degree. Repetitive tasks, for instance, can be fully substituted by robots while tasks that are more complex will continue, for the present, to rely on conventional labour inputs. This will initially lead to a skill-biased technological development. The main implications of the changing nature of jobs, tasks and required skills point to the significance of continuous human capital development (Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2017). In the future, the nature of production may show that machines (robots or other automation devices) and workers will interact with one another. For instance, tasks that require intensive use of manual labour can be divided in that the workers' input is limited to supervision or control of machines. This division of labour between human resources and machines may increase the individual worker's productivity as the exhausting manual tasks can be performed by machines. The working time that becomes available due to the use of machines can be reallocated to tasks that require more cognitive skills. Thus, semi-automation (interactions between workers and robots) may moderate the negative employment effect that is often associated with the notion of factory automation (Lütkenhorst, 2018).

A quantification of such automation effects on employment in a more disaggregated framework shows that the manufacturing sector still plays a crucial role for total employment across industries and sectors (Autor and Salomons, 2018). Autor and Salomons' study confirms that automation-induced productivity growth does indeed have a negative employment effect within the respective industries. However, when separating the direct and indirect effects, the results suggest that inter-industry and final demand effects may offset the negative effects for labour demand. These effects may be reversed in particular through input-output linkages (i.e. becoming a supplier for intermediate goods for another industry). Moreover, the increase in aggregate demand may lead to a positive net effect on employment. Autor and Salomons' estimates show that the electrical and optical equipment industry and the chemicals and chemical products industries have registered substantial negative employment effects within their industries. Indirect effects (input-output linkages and final demand) are actually one of the biggest contributors to job creation in the whole economy.

The changes in industrialisation processes suggest that the trends in technology and globalisation fundamentally affect traditional development patterns within the manufacturing sector. However, a study by Hallward-Driemeier and Nayyar (2018: 139) finds evidence that, "manufacturing will likely continue to deliver on productivity, scale, trade, and innovation, but just not with the same number of jobs". Thus, despite the emergence of a new paradigm, the role of the industrial sector is still important.

The new trends in industrialisation give rise to potential challenges but also to opportunities for developing and emerging economies. A strong focus on human capital development and scaling up of technology adoption can transform uncertainty into opportunities. UNIDO (2017a), for instance, finds that the information and communication technology (ICT) revolution that began in the late 1970s has changed the required skill set of workers in the manufacturing sector. Additional skills are necessary to exploit the advantages of new technologies. Not only well-trained workers, but the country's general infrastructure play a crucial role in the optimal adoption of such technologies. Poor quality of infrastructure (for example, sub-standard transport connections or unreliable telecommunication grids) is an additional challenge developing and emerging countries face in the development of their manufacturing sector.

The establishment of new production systems and the upgrade of existing ones requires sound and reliable infrastructure in order to absorb new technologies (UNIDO, 2017a). According to the OECD (2018), early adoption of digital infrastructure such as a reliable telecommunication infrastructure (high-speed internet access) or more sophisticated technologies (for instance, the Blockchain), may lead to 'leapfrogging' within the manufacturing sector and thus promotes an inclusive and sustainable future development.

Another important implication of the changing nature of industrialisation concerns the demand and supply channel, discussed at the beginning of the chapter. The shrewd use of automation technology may have two substantial effects on the characteristics of the goods produced. Specialisation enhances the *quality* of the produced goods through process and product standardisation. Increased demand due to higher quality can lead to the massification of products, which in turn results in a price reduction. Both effects lead to stimulation of demand, thus triggering the expansion of manufacturing capacities. This can compensate potential negative externalities such as wage decreases arising from automation.

Connected to the interplay between demand and supply forces, globalisation opens another opportunity for the future of a country's manufacturing sector. Technological progress and innovations make global value chains and foreign markets much more accessible. According to the OECD (2018), developing and emerging countries, in particular, benefited from participation in global value chains through two channels. First, producing intermediate goods for foreign industries triggers the expansion of industries supplying the required goods. Second, access to foreign markets creates new demand, fuelling the virtuous circle of manufacturing consumption. There is, however, a possibility that new technologies may diminish the comparative advantage of specific industries (mainly labour-intensive and low-tech industries) in developing countries. For example, bringing back offshore production plants (reshoring) to high-income countries through automation could potentially pose a threat for developing countries in the long term (OECD, 2018). If reshoring occurs on a large scale, it might prevent developing countries from successfully entering labour-intensive industries, which traditionally boosted initial industrialisation of developing countries, particularly in Asia.

Related to the employment effects, the new technological paradigm may have diverse effects on income distribution and on gender aspects. Through the relative shift of demand from low- to high-skilled labour, income inequality is expected to increase (OECD, 2018). There is no clear consensus on how severely automation may affect certain social groups, like women, young workers or marginalised groups. In general, low-skilled workers and those who predominantly carry out repetitive tasks are more vulnerable in the face of automation and thus require special attention on the path towards inclusive economic development. However, an intersectoral perspective suggests that automation could in fact promote a path towards gender inclusive manufacturing development. The main reason is the declining importance of physical strength due to advanced automation. Moreover, many governments have placed the creation of gender-equal employment opportunities at the top of their agendas, thus promoting an inclusive environment for future expansion (Alibhai et al., 2017).

Finally, a careful analysis of any given economy is necessary to shape the future of the manufacturing sector in a sustainable way. Once potential opportunities are identified, industrial policy can help promote beneficial developments. To effectively deal with the challenges arising from automation and digitalisation in the manufacturing sector, policymakers should prioritise human capital and skills development. Governments and policymakers can use the changing nature of industrialisation as an opportunity for future development. A strong policy focus on education and training pays off, particularly in the shift from low- to high-skilled labour demand due to automation in the manufacturing sector. New skills and well-educated workers are essential for optimal implementation and operation of new technologies. Thus, policymakers should prioritise and increase public investment in education infrastructure to effectively deal with the challenges of new technology implementation. As automation may have negative effects on employment in labour-intensive industries, special emphasis should be placed on retraining and redeployment measures for workers who have lost their jobs. This helps promote socially inclusive development while using new technologies in an optimal way (UNCTAD, 2016).

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has shown that the process of industrialisation in general and the manufacturing sector in particular are still major drivers of poverty reduction across the globe. The manufacturing sector boasts a higher productivity and higher productivity growth rate than the agricultural sector, fostering persistent employment and income generation. A distinction between the supply and demand side reveals the importance of technology and skill development for the expansion of production capacities. Moreover, the virtuous circle of manufacturing consumption, as part of the demand side, exposes the driving forces behind the diversification and massification of manufacturing demand. The interplay between demand and supply forces shapes the process of structural transformation and thus has a significant impact on the economy's development.

Starting with the impact of trade on the industrial diversification process, we find that penetrating into new markets has a significant effect on the entire economy through manufacturing consumption. Newly created demand, global technology spillover effects and access to an established global production network play a pivotal role for the manufacturing sector's expansion. Additionally, opening up for trade fosters FDI inflows to bring much needed capital and know-how to developing countries, driving down the relative price of manufactured products through increased competition and new product varieties which re-triggers the virtuous circle of manufacturing consumption.

These forces create employment opportunities, especially in developing countries. A major source for employment in the countries is low-tech and labour-intensive industries related to basic human needs. Formal employment opportunities are created, demand for manufactured products rises, thus significantly contributing to income growth. This opportunity should be used to foster human capital investments (education and skill development) to promote increases in productivity by promoting the ability to implement new technological innovations in the future. Marginalised groups, youth and women in particular can benefit considerably from successful industrialisation, which makes the industrial sector a relevant factor for a sustainable and inclusive future.

The expansion of the manufacturing sector is often associated with an increase in harmful greenhouse gas emissions and extensive use of natural resources. This chapter has provided a strategy to sidestep the environmental trade-off pattern by implementing technological advances in production processes and production structures. Ensuring the flow of green innovations and relevant knowledge from high- to low-income countries is indispensable. Developing countries in particular will thereby benefit from existing technologies and can pursue environmentally friendly production processes.

Linked to this, as industrialisation is a heterogeneous phenomenon, this chapter has placed special emphasis on recent trends within certain industries. The changing nature of industrialisation is characterised by a process of automation and we have highlighted the need for a disaggregated view to assess the actual effects of this process on employment patterns. It turns out that despite negative direct employment effects within certain industries, demand and inter-industry effects can exert a positive net effect and thus create job opportunities. Moreover, a strong focus on human capital development and scaling up of technology adoption can transform the uncertainty related to this new paradigm into an opportunity, especially for developing countries.

Finally, three core policy considerations for structural transformation to move towards inclusive and sustainable industrial development have been discussed in the chapter: First, policies to foster production capabilities within firms and improve the reallocation of production factors across firms are essential for the expansion of capacities in relevant industries. Second, capturing domestic and foreign demand requires policymakers to provide investments and establish a business climate in which development opportunities can be efficiently realised. Third, the responsibility of industrial policy in the industrialisation process for harnessing inclusiveness and sustainability has been highlighted.

NOTES

1. This is a measure for the total estimate of net-output of all resident manufacturing activity units obtained by adding up outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs.
2. The Sustainable Development Goal 5 ("Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls") tackles this issue in a much more comprehensive way.
3. This relationship is also known as the Environmental Kuznets Curve (see Grossman and Krueger, 1991; Shafik and Bandyopadhyay, 1992).

REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D. and P. Restrepo (2018), *Automation and New Tasks: The Implications of the Task Content of Technology for Labor Demand*, Available at: http://papers.nber.org/conf_papers/f114668.pdf [Accessed 27 February 2018].

Alibhai, S., N. Buehren, S. Papineni and R. Pierotti (2017), *Crossovers-Female Entrepreneurs Who Enter Male Sectors: Evidence from Ethiopia*, Policy Research Working Paper 8065, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Autor, D. (2015), *Why Are There Still So Many Jobs? The History and Future of Workplace Automation*, Journal of Economic Perspectives, 29/3, pp. 3-30.

Autor, D. and A. Salomons (2018), *Is Automation Labor-Displacing? Productivity Growth, Employment, and the Labor Share*, NBER Working Paper No. 24871, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Becker, G.S. (1965), *A Theory of the Allocation of Time*, The Economic Journal, 75/299, pp. 493-517.

Braunstein, E. (2019), *Gender-Inclusive Industrialization for Growth and Development in the Context of Globalization*, in *Gender equality and inclusive growth: Economic policies to achieve sustainable development*, Elson, D. and S. Anuradha (eds.), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women).

Cantore, N. and E. Padilla (2010), *Emissions Distribution in Post–Kyoto International Negotiations: A Policy Perspective*, Barcelona: Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona.

Chataway, J., R. Hanlin and R. Kaplinsky (2014), *Inclusive Innovation: An Architecture for Policy Development*, Innovation and Development, 1/4, pp. 33-54.

DeLong, J.B. (2000), *Cornucopia: The Pace of Economic Growth in the Twentieth Century*, NBER Working Paper No. 7602, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Eicher, T.S. and D.J. Kuenzel (2016), *The Elusive Effects of Trade on Growth: Export Diversity and Economic Take-off*, Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique, 49/1, pp. 264-295.

Foellmi, R., T. Wuergler and L. Zweimüller (2014), *The Macroeconomics of Model T*, Journal of Economic Theory, 153, pp. 617-647.

Greenwood, J., A. Seshadri and M. Yorukoglu (2005), *Engines of Liberation*, Review of Economic Studies, 72/1, pp. 109-133.

Grossman, G.M, and A.B. Krueger (1991), *Environmental Impacts of a North American Free Trade Agreement*, NBER Working Paper No. 3914, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Guerrieri, P. and V. Meliciani (2005), *Technology and International Competitiveness: The Interdependence between Manufacturing and Producer Services*, Structural Change and Economic Dynamics, 16/4, pp. 489–502.

Hallward-Driemeier, M. and G. Nayyar (2018), *Trouble in the making? The future of manufacturing-led development*, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Haraguchi, N. (2016), *Patterns of Structural Change and Manufacturing Development*, in Routledge Handbook of Industry and Development, Weiss, J. and M. Tribe (eds.), New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 38-64.

Haraguchi, N., C. F. C., Cheng and E. Smeets (2017), *The importance of manufacturing in economic development: Has this changed?*, World Development, 93, pp. 293-315.

Haraguchi, N. (2019), *Structural Transformation and Manufacturing Employment*, Monga, C. and J. Lin (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Structural Transformation, New York: Oxford University Press.

Jong, H. (2015), *Living Standards in a Modernizing World-A Long-Run Perspective on Material Wellbeing and Human Development*, in *Global Handbook of Quality of Life*, Glatzer, W., L. Camfield, V. Møller and M. Rojas (eds.), Dordrecht, Heidelberg, New York, NY and London: Springer, pp. 45–74.

Kabeer, N. (1999), *Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurement of Women's Empowerment*, Development and Change, 30/3, pp. 435-464.

Kaldor, N. (1966), *Causes of the Slow Rate of Economic Growth of the United Kingdom: An Inaugural Lecture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaldor, N. (1967), *Strategic Factors in Economic Development*, Ithaca, NY: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.

Lewis, W. A. (1954), *Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour*, The Manchester School, 22, pp. 139-191.

Lütkenhorst, W. (2018), *Creating wealth without labour? Emerging contours of a new techno-economic landscape*, Discussion Paper 11/2018, Bonn: German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE).

Matsuyama, K. (2002), *The Rise of Mass Consumption Societies*, Journal of Political Economy, 110/5, pp. 1035-1070.

Mazzanti, M. and F. Nicolli (2017), *Structural Change and Manufacturing Sustainability,* Background paper prepared for the report *Structural Change for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development*, Vienna: UNIDO.

Nussbaum, M.C. (1992), *Human Functioning and Social Justice: In Defense of Aristotelian Essentialism*, Political Theory, 20/2, pp. 202-246.

OECD (2018), *Achieving Inclusive Growth in the Face of Digital Transformation and the Future of Work*, OECD report to G-20 Finance Ministers 19 March 2018.

OECD-WTO (2019) *Aid for Trade Global Review 2019 Monitoring Exercise.*

Pain, N., I. Koske and M. Sollie (2008), *Globalisation and OECD Consumer Price Inflation*, OECD Journal: Economic Studies 2008/1, Paris: OECD Publishing, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eco_studies-v2008-art4-en.

Saviotti, P.P. and A. Pyka (2004), *Economic Development by the Creation of New Sectors*, Journal of Evolutionary Economics, 14/1, pp. 1-35.

Sen, A. (1990), *More Than 100 Million Women Are Missing*, The New York Review of Books, Available at: www.nybooks.com/articles/1990/12/20/more-than-100-million-women-are-missing [Accessed 27 February 2018].

Sen, A. (2001), *Development as Freedom*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Shafik, N. and S. Bandyopadhyay (1992), *Economic Growth and Environmental Quality: Time Series and Cross-Country Evidence,* Policy Research Working Papers WPS 904, World Development Report, Washington, DC: World Bank, http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/833431468739515725/pdf/multi-page.pdf [Accessed 27 February 2018].

Szirmai, A. (2012), *Industrialisation as an Engine of Growth in Developing Countries, 1950-2005*, Structural Change and Economic Dynamics, 23/4, pp. 406-420.

Timmer, M.P., E. Dietzenbacher, B. Los, R. Stehrer and G.J. de Vries (2015), *An Illustrated User Guide to the World Input–Output Database: the Case of Global Automotive Production*, Review of International Economics 23, pp. 575-605.

UNCTAD (2013), *Trade and Development Report 2013: Adjusting to the Changing Dynamics of the World Economy*, New York, NY and Geneva: United Nations.

UNCTAD (2017), *Industrial Robots and Inclusive Growth*, Policy Brief 60, Geneva: United Nations.

UNIDO (2009), *Industrial Development Report 2009, Breaking In and Moving Up: New Industrial Challenges for the Bottom Billion and the Middle-Income Countries*, Vienna.

UNIDO (2013), *Industrial Development Report 2013, Sustaining Employment Growth: The Role of Manufacturing and Structural Change*, Vienna.

UNIDO (2015), *Industrial Development Report 2016, The Role of Technology and Innovation in Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development*, Vienna.

UNIDO (2017a), *Structural Change for Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development*, Vienna.

UNIDO (2017b), *Industrial Development Report 2018, Demand for Manufacturing: Driving Inclusive and Sustainable Industrial Development*, Vienna.

UNIDO (2017c), *Circular Economy*, Vienna.

Woersdorfer, J.S. (2017), *The Evolution of Household Technology and Consumer Behavior, 1800–2000*, Oxon and New York, NY: Routledge.

World Bank (2012), *World Development Report 2012, Gender Equality and Development*, Washington, DC.

CHAPTER 4

AID FOR TRADE IN CHALLENGING CONTEXTS

Contributed by the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)[1]

Abstract: *The least developed countries face the greatest challenges in realizing the full potential of economic diversification with all the benefits that it can bring for economic growth, development and poverty reduction. While trade flows remain vital for LDC economies, their share in world trade is still below 1%. LDC merchandise exports are highly concentrated in few products. Primary commodities account for over 60% of the LDC exports making these countries very vulnerable to the external shocks. These trends are even more pronounced in the LDCs which identified themselves as fragile under g7+ initiative. In those countries top three export products represent at least 40% of their merchandise exports.*

The Chapter provides an overview of the existing evidence on the linkages between export concentration and fragility. While acknowledging that there is no one size-fits-all solution, it highlights several options in addressing structural challenges of LDC economies. Building on the OECD Aid for Trade data, the Chapter points out that Aid for Trade flows to LDCs are highly concentrated among key recipients, key sectors, and key development partners. For the past five years, commitments have fluctuated, but disbursements have remained stable. The flows to g7+ LDCs have remained broadly stagnant for the past five years. Finding a better response in fragile contexts requires greater coherence between humanitarian, development and peacebuilding efforts. Remaining cognizant of local contexts, institutional strengthening, and statebuilding and peacebuilding efforts is key in designing future aid-for-trade programmes.

INTRODUCTION

The least developed countries (LDCs) have made tremendous progress in development over the last 30 years with an improvement in the Human Development Index of 51% since 1990, on average (UNDP, 2018). And yet, many challenges remain because progress has not been even across or within countries: more than 300 million people in the LDCs live in extreme poverty, and 237 million are undernourished (OHRLLS, 2018).

The Istanbul Programme of Action for the LDCs (IPOA) 2011-2020 defines specific milestones in the path of these countries towards the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including some important trade-related objectives. The IPOA foresees in particular that half of the LDCs would meet the graduation criteria by 2020. To date, five countries have transitioned out of LDC status since 1971 when the category was established, and Vanuatu and Angola are scheduled to do so in 2020-2021. Ten additional countries are at different stages of meeting the graduation thresholds,[2] which points to a heightened pace of graduation over the past several years.

Decisions on graduation from LDC status are made by the UN General Assembly based on recommendations by the Committee for Development Policy (CDP) endorsed by the Social and Economic Council (ECOSOC). Every three years, the CPD holds triennial reviews of the LDC category to advise on the inclusion of countries into and out of graduation from the LDC list. The review is undertaken based on three criteria: Gross National Income (GNI) per capita, the Human Assets Index (HAI) and the Economic Vulnerability Index (EVI). A country that meets two of the three criteria at two consecutive triennial reviews of the CDP is considered for graduation. Alternatively, a country may be considered for graduation if its income per capita is double the income threshold. As of to date, 35 LDCs are yet to meet at least two of the three graduation criteria before they can be considered for graduation.

More broadly, graduation from LDC status requires triggering and sustaining a process of structural transformation to allow these countries to generate growth that is pro-poor and environmentally sustainable. Economic and export diversification, value addition in exports and upgrading in value chains is generally associated with economic transformation (McKechnie, A. et. al., 2018). While this process is essentially nationally driven, the international community can assist by creating an enabling environment for the integration of the LDCs into the world economy, such as through preferential market access schemes and the provision of development cooperation, such as through aid-for-trade programmes, that helps lift constraints in the LDCs.

This chapter reviews aid-for-trade flows to the LDCs and makes recommendations to enhance aid for trade's effectiveness as a tool to support economic diversification in the LDCs. The chapter discusses the special circumstances of countries affected by fragility and conflict and how aid for trade can be more effective in responding to their needs.

This focus echoes the call of a group of LDCs in accession, which during the 11th Session of the WTO Ministerial Conference (MC11) held in 2017 in Buenos Aires, Argentina, issued a Declaration calling attention to the challenges of fragility and conflict for development, security and peace. They underscored the importance of international trade for economic growth, employment and development and the need to enhance cooperation to facilitate the effective participation of these countries in the multilateral trading system (WTO, 2017).

This chapter is structured as follows: Section I discusses stylized features of the LDCs' economies to underscore that economic and export diversification represents a priority for development and poverty reduction in the LDCs. This Section further focuses on the particular circumstances of the g7+ LDCs – a group of self-designated countries that are or have been affected by fragility and conflict – to underline the importance of economic and export diversification in promoting stability and peace in such contexts. Section II reviews the aid-for-trade priorities of LDCs and the g7+ LDCs for economic diversification and how aid for trade is responding to these. This section discusses support to the economic foundations of the g7+ LDCs and the complexity of supporting economic diversification in fragile contexts. Section III concludes.

THE IMPERATIVE OF ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION IN THE LDCs

> *"Trade is an engine of economic growth in the development process and is essential to increasing productivity that stimulates export-led economic growth".* – Guinea, OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019).

Development and economic diversification in the LDCs

Economic development is associated with structural transformation, which can be defined as the shift of resources from low to higher productivity sectors as well as improvements in productivity within sectors (McMillan, M. et. al., 2017). Renewed interest in structural transformation is underpinned by recent growth experiences in developing countries, particularly some LDCs in Africa, which have failed to create broad based economic growth, employment and poverty reduction. This has focused policy attention to the pattern or quality of growth.

Theory and evidence indicate that structural transformation at early stages of development involves economic and trade diversification (Papageorgiou, C., et. al., 2012). While some LDCs have over time managed to change the structure of their production and export base, the process has been uneven across the LDCs and, generally, the pace and depth of change has remained below that of other developing countries.

Agriculture remains a major economic sector for the LDCs. The sector represents 22% of GDP value added in the LDCs against 8.5% only in other developing countries (UNCTAD, 2018). Moreover, the rate at which agriculture sheds labour in the LDCs is significantly slower than in other developing countries: between 2000 and 2017, the average employment share of agriculture fell by 73% in other developing countries but only by 17% in the LDCs (see Table 4.A1 in the Annex). On the other hand, agriculture labour productivity in the LDCs is only a fraction of that of other developing countries (18.7% between 2011 and 2013), and the gap is widening, which explains the divergent trend in income levels (UNCTAD, 2015).

> *"Agriculture is the main employer and source of income for the country which also contributes to feeding the population. There is a need to support this field to guarantee food supplies."* – Yemen, OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019).

Box 4.1. Boosting export diversification in Togo

Agriculture remains essential for greater value addition of the Togolese economy, accounting for 40% of the GDP, while employing over half of the population. With the mining sector still pronounced in the share of goods exports, increasingly, Togo is becoming a services hub due to air and transport infrastructure.

Togolese exports are concentrated in 10 to 15 key products. The progress on export diversification is marked by two products: palm oil and oilseeds (soybeans). While the macroeconomic impact remains limited, these two sectors have significant potential for poverty reduction.

Both the private sector and development partners are playing an important role in supporting palm oil and soybean value chain development. The Togolese palm oil sector received a USD 65 million investment from Kalyan Agrovet Investments for the construction of a palm oil processing plant. With a USD 3 million of EIF investments, soybean farmers have doubled soybean production in 2018 and improved their marketing capacities, which has been identified as a problem for 84% of producers according to a recent survey.

Source: Adapted from the DTIS Update of Togo (2017).

The LDCs represent 13% of the world population but less than 1% of world trade. The participation of the LDCs in world trade remains marginal, and recently, it fell below the 1% threshold. Moreover, three LDCs – Angola, Bangladesh and Myanmar – account for over half of the LDC share of merchandise exports. The top ten LDC exporters of commercial services account for over 70% of the group's services receipt (WTO, 2018). These figures point to very uneven patterns of participation of the LDCs in world trade.

The composition of LDC exports vary significantly across countries. Fuels and minerals are the main merchandise exports of the LDCs in Africa (47%), while Asian LDC exports are largely made of manufactures (72%). The Small Islands LDCs export mainly food and agriculture products (82%) (Table 4.A2 in the Annex). There are no marked differences in the composition of imports of the LDCs with manufactured goods accounting for more than two thirds of imports (Table 4.A3 in the Annex).

The diverse composition of LDC exports reflects different paths, pace of economic diversification, and structural transformation among these countries (UNCTAD, 2014). For instance, productivity gains have doubled in Asian LDCs that export manufacture, compared with African LDCs, which export mainly fuels and mineral commodities. Kucera et Jiang (2018) acknowledge the importance of manufacturing in the transition from agriculture employment. UNCTAD notes that the largest productivity gains have been achieved through the shift of resources from agriculture to services. However, additional employment in the latter sector has seen a greater increase in the informal economy with lower productivity overall than in manufactures, thus failing to drive strong economy-wide productivity improvement and growth. At the same time, both Guerrieri and Meliciani (2005) and Andreoni and Gomez (2012) provide evidence of new opportunities resulting from complementarities between services and manufacturing, particularly for ICT-intensive services and knowledge-intensive manufacturing.

Empirical analysis indicates that the complexity of production and exports matters for economic growth (McMillan et. al. 2017) and that diversification is path dependent. The Hausmann et. al. (2007) product space analysis suggests that countries may diversify their economies and exports building upon existing competencies and productive capacities. On the other hand, Rodrick's (2013) work on unconditional convergence suggests that labour productivity in manufacturing activities across countries will converge regardless of country specific characteristics, such as policies, institutions, etc. This would imply that building productive capacity in manufacturing would be particularly valuable for improving the future quality of production and exports and converging towards high-income levels.


Mishra, S. et. al. (2011) explore whether diversification of services exports and particularly their sophistication can be a driver of economic growth similar to manufacturing. Their results suggest that indeed, the sophistication of services exports is associated with high growth, and that results hold after controlling for the size of the domestic services sector and goods sophistication. Moreover, their results hold for low income countries, which leads them to suggest that high quality services may provide a path for economic and export diversification for poor countries.

Exports by the LDCs of commercial services are increasing at a fast pace, but they remain negligible. Asian LDCs saw exports of commercial services increase at an annual rate of 8.5% between 2009 and 2016. The growth rate for Small Islands LDCs (6.9%), Haiti (5.4%) and African LDCs (11.1%) is also high (UNCTADstats 2019).

Merchandise trade flows in the LDCs tend to be volatile due to the composition of exports and their high degree of concentration. Sixty-four per cent (64%) of LDC exports are made of primary commodities subject to a relatively high price volatility (Figure 4.1). In 2015, for example, the price of oil fell by 47%, adding to an initial drop of 7.5% in 2014 (Box 4.2). The prices of other primary commodities, such as minerals, ore and metals, and agriculture raw materials also fell, thus eroding the economic growth of the LDCs that year with real GDP growth estimated at 3.5%, the lowest since 1994 (UNCTAD 2016). On the other hand, high commodity prices that lead to exchange rate appreciation undermine the competitiveness of other sectors and economic and export diversification.

"The Chadian economy is mainly based on cash crops (especially cotton) and extractive industries (mining and oil). The strong economic growth - 7.4% between 2003 and 2015 - was mainly due to the use of oil resources. The country is extremely vulnerable to the external shocks including fluctuation of commodity prices. To diversify its economy, the country will rely on sectors with high export potential including leather, sesame and gum arabic identified in the DTIS Update of Chad. Improving organization of those sectors will contribute to greater economies of scale thereby helping with greater integration into the global value chains." – Chad, OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019).

Figure 4.1. Commodity price index (2015=100)



Source: UNCTADstat database, (accessed February 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953242

Box 4.2. Export diversification in Chad: The promise of gum arabic

The extractive sector – mainly oil – is the main driver of Chad's economy. However, efforts towards economic diversification have turned Chad into a significant player in the world trade of gum arabic – an additive contained in frizzy drinks, food and cosmetics: Chad is among the top three world exporters. The Chadian market is dominated by two types of gum arabic: hard, so-called Kitir, and friable, which sells for one third of Kitir (IRAM 2013).

Chad exported over 13,000 tons of crude gum arabic between 2014 and2016 through N'Djamena airport or Douala port in Cameroon (UNCTAD 2018).

Working together with the EIF, UNIDO, UNDP and ITC, Chad has made considerable progress in moving up the gum arabic value chain. Today, a newly developed marketing label – "Cristal of Chad" – is reaching new export markets. According to ITC (2017), the volume of exports is expected to double in the next five years with India being among top target markets.

Replanting acacia trees has proven to be essential to ensure the sustainability of resources of gum arabic, thereby preventing future environmental risks.

Source: Adapted from Chad's OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019) questionnaire, ITC (2017), UNCTAD (2018) and IRAM (2013)..

Economic and export diversification would help the LDCs buffer the effects of external shocks. Koren, M. et. al. (2007) note that economic diversification can increase the resilience of low income countries to external shocks in particular by moving away from sectors that are highly volatile and correlated, such as mining and agriculture. Papageorgiou, C. et. al. (2012) further make the point that export diversification is associated with lower terms-of-trade volatility and that market diversification also builds resilience against external shocks.

Infrastructure services including reliable electricity and transport are key enablers in supporting economic diversification and trade (Hoeffler, A., 1999). Unreliable and poor infrastructure increases costs to private enterprises, hampering the development of the private sector.

> *"The country suffers from lack of infrastructure to support the production and marketing of goods and services, difficulties of ensuring the connectivity of different entities as well as the deficit in the supply of energy."* – Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019).

Inadequate access to electricity for productive activities remains a barrier to economic diversification and structural transformation in the LDCs. Despite significant progress in access to energy (45% of the population for the LDCs on average), it remains significantly below the level of access in other developing countries (92%) (Table 4.A5 in the Annex). Moreover, two thirds of energy consumption in the LDCs consists of residential use, mostly from traditional biomass sources, such as charcoal and fuelwood (UNCTAD, 2017), alluding to the limited use of modern electricity for productive economic activities in these countries.

In Africa, power generation capacity is low, and part of the existing capacity is unavailable due to poor maintenance. Emergency or self-generation of electricity through diesel plants poses a heavy burden on the economy, estimated at 1% of GDP (McKechnie, A. et. al., 2018).

Transport infrastructure is another significant constraint for the LDCs. The median road density is 2,147 km per million people in the LDCs, compared to 3,446 km per million people in 58 developing countries (UNCTAD, 2017). In addition, only 22% of the roads in the LDCs are paved.

The Logistics Performance Index (LPI) provides a summary measure of the efficiency of the logistics sector that allows goods to move across borders based on the perception of international operators in the sector. The index provides an assessment of six components, including trade and transport infrastructure and the efficiency of customs and border clearance. The LDC average ranking in the Aggregated LPI[3] is 128, i.e., within the fourth lowest quintile among 167 countries, which indicates that the connectivity of LDC economies is limited.

On the other hand, the LDCs have made major progress in relation to Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). Overall, the LDCs have significantly increased both access and affordability to the internet. According to ITU (2018), the LDCs are on course to reach averages of 97% mobile broadband coverage of their population and achieve internet prices of less than 5% of monthly GNI per capita by 2020. On the other hand, only 1 in 4 persons in the LDCs will be using the internet due to lack of necessary skills.

Economic governance institutions act as enablers to economic diversification and structural transformation. A good investment climate provides opportunities and incentives for firms to invest productively, create jobs and expand, therefore promoting economic growth and poverty reduction (Sinha, S. et al., 2013).

Using the World Bank's Ease of Doing Business rankings as an indicator of the quality of the business environment shows that the LDC average stands at 147 (out of 190), indicating space for overall improvements. The rankings, however, vary across the LDCs. Moreover, Afghanistan, Djibouti, Rwanda and Togo are among the top 10 reformers in the 2019 Doing Business survey, suggesting that there is increasing awareness about the importance of reform and that the situation is dynamic.

The discussion above underlines the importance of economic and export diversification for the LDCs to support sustained economic growth. Shifting resources from low-productivity agriculture towards activities of higher productivity within agriculture and in services and manufacturing is essential for economic development that is more inclusive and sustainable. Moreover, the production of high-quality products and services would be associated with higher economic growth and, in the case of manufacturing, allow for unconditional convergence towards higher income levels. Economic and export diversification would buffer the LDCs from the volatility of terms of trade, thus enhancing growth stability. Evidence by Papageorgiou, C., et. al. (2012) on country experiences suggests that effective policy and reforms to support economic diversification should be implemented in 'waves', adapting to the changing external environment and the evolving country conditions.

The process of economic diversification and structural transformation requires productive investments in the LDCs, both public and private. Mechanisms to enhance domestic resource mobilization are therefore important in this context. Reforms of the business environment would be essential for mobilizing private domestic and foreign investment. Foreign direct investment (FDI) can help linking the LDCs to regional and global value chains, thereby creating opportunities for economic diversification.

In addition to broad policy fundamentals, more targeted policy efforts are necessary (UNCTAD 2014 and McMillan, M., et. al., 2017), and the international community can play a supportive role in this context. The development of human capital and skills, especially among women and youth, is necessary to allow them to participate in emerging economic opportunities. ICT skills in particular are essential for taking part in the emerging digital economy.

Different chapters in this volume discuss in detail policies and strategies to support economic diversification in developing countries, including the LDCs.

Economic diversification in fragile and conflict-affected contexts

During MC11, several LDCs in the accession process to the WTO reiterated their commitment to the reform process, underpinning accession while calling for enhanced cooperation to facilitate their effective participation in the multilateral trading system.

They are all members of the g7+, which includes the LDCs and other developing countries self-designated as fragile and conflict-affected. They work with development partners to improve the effectiveness of Official Development Assistance (ODA) in fragile contexts. Their commitments were captured in the New Deal of Engagement in Fragile States adopted at the High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan, Republic of Korea, in 2011.

This Section discusses why it is important for fragile and conflict-affected countries to diversify their economies beyond the benefits concerning structural transformation for the LDCs mentioned above.

Box 4.3. The New Deal of Engagement in Fragile States and the Peacebuilding and Statebuilding Goals (PSGs)

The New Deal of Engagement encapsulates the commitment of countries affected by fragility and conflict, led by the g7+ group, development partners and civil society, to improve development policy and practice in fragile contexts. Partners to the New Deal committed to working towards one plan, under one shared vision and a commitment to transparency, accountability, predictability of financing and shared risk management and to strengthening and using country systems.

The g7+ proposes a fragility spectrum of five stages, starting at situations of crisis moving towards rebuilding and reform, transition, transformation and resilience that cut across five PSGs, which the New Deal of Engagement in Fragile States seeks to prioritize:

- PSG1-Legitimate politics: fostering inclusive political settlement and conflict resolution;
- PSG2-Security: establishing and strengthening people's security;
- PSG3-Justice: addressing injustices and increasing people's access to justice;
- PSG4-Economic foundations: generating employment and livelihoods; and
- PSG5-Revenue and services: managing revenue and building capacity for accountable and fair service delivery.

The g7+ group is composed of 20 countries* that share experiences and support each other and advocate for country-led and country-owned processes in addressing fragility and conflict.

* *The g7+ countries are: Afghanistan, Burundi, Central African Republic (CAR), Chad, Comoros, Ivory Coast, DRC, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, Sáo Tomé and Príncipe, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo and Yemen.*

Source: g7+ 2019 http://g7plus.org/, https://www.pbsbdialogue.org/en/new-deal/about-new-deal/ .

Fragility and conflict

The g7+ countries partners in the New Deal, define fragility as "a period of time during nationhood when sustainable socio-economic development requires greater emphasis on complementary peacebuilding and statebuilding activities." (g7+ 2013). The Group proposes a spectrum of fragility of five stages, from crisis associated mainly with conflict, to resilience (Box 4.3).

The adoption of the SDGs has reinforced the principles of the New Deal through the recognition that peaceful and inclusive societies, access to justice for all, and effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels encapsulated in SDG16, are objectives of universal application and essential for advancing sustainable development.

Box 4.4. Channels of trade impact in policical stability and conflict

The **opportunity cost** mechanism refers to changes in real income and how these may increase or reduce the relative value of engaging in violent activities. Declines in export prices, increases in import prices and declines in external demand that reduce real incomes and thus income foregone by choosing to engage in violence increase the risk of conflict.

The **rapacity effect** refers to the incentive to fight for the control of valuable resources. This effect is particularly salient for point-source commodities when prices increase.

The **resource effect** refers to the mechanism through which increases in the price of commodities under the control (taxation) of parties to the conflict (e.g., government or rebel groups) can finance the means to suppress or enhance fighting by either side to the conflict.

Source: Cali, M. (2015). *Trading Away from Conflict. Using trade to increase resilience in fragile states*, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Economic diversification in fragile and conflict-affected contexts

The previous Section underlined the importance of economic diversification in the LDCs for structural transformation and development. In the context of fragile and conflict-affected contexts, economic diversification could also be important for peace: Research and empirical analysis suggest that economic specialization in certain products and the volatility associated to trade flows under certain circumstances may increase the risk of violence and conflict.

This Section explains the mechanisms based on a framework provided by Cali, M. (2015) building on the work of Collier, P., A. Hoeffler et. al. (2004) regarding the economic incentives of actors to resort to violence and conflict. Cali describes three mechanisms through which changes in trade flows can influence political stability and conflict (Box 4.4).

The framework further makes a distinction between "point source" commodities, such as oil and minerals, which are very valuable, do not create significant employment and can be easily controlled, and "diffused commodities", notably agriculture, which are labour intensive and more difficult to control though may be important for funding of armed groups controlling local areas (through taxation). Higher prices of point source commodities increase incentives to fight for their control (rapacity effect). An increase in the price of diffused commodities would increase the income of local producers and thus increase the opportunity cost to engage in violence, thus reducing the risk of conflict. A fall in the price of diffused commodities would have the opposite effect, i.e., increasing the risks of conflict (opportunity cost effect), though it could make it easier for armed groups to finance their activities (resource effect), thus increasing the risk of conflict or its duration.

Cali's cross-country analysis provides stronger evidence for the rapacity effect, indicating that swings in commodity prices affect the probability of conflict by increasing the competition for point source commodities that experience rising prices. An analysis by UNCTAD regarding the relationship between international trade and civil conflict similarly suggests that certain export commodities tend to have a stronger influence on conflict than others. This would be the case of oil and gas and labour-intensive industries, for which an illicit and lucrative trade exists (UNCTAD, 2004), because trade in such commodities can finance conflict (mainly through financing of armed groups) (resource effect).


Another strand of research has emphasized the linkages between economic specialization and export concentration in primary commodities and the quality of institutions. Fearon, J. (2005), makes the argument that oil revenues create less incentives to build administrative competencies and control over the national territory in oil-dependent countries and that it is the relatively weak state institutions compared to countries at similar per capita income levels that make countries vulnerable to conflict. His evidence suggests that the same argument can be made about other primary commodity exports, where the state revenue depends on their taxation, on average, though the evidence is weaker than for crude oil. In either case, the prize of controlling a valuable resource provides incentives to engage in violence and conflict (rapacity effect).

Other research has focused on the implications of the volatility of revenue as the underlying factor leading to conflict. Guillaumont, P. et. al. (2005) suggest that it is the instability associated with external shocks that matter for conflict as opposed to the specialization in particular commodities *per se*. Building on work by Collier, P., and A. Hoeffler, (2004) on the linkages between primary commodities and conflict, Guillaumont, P. et. al. (2005) find that "when instability of exports, weighted by the openness rate, is introduced in the Collier-Hoeffler conflict occurrence model, not only the coefficient of determination increases significantly, but the share of primary commodities in exports also becomes insignificant. Guillaumont, P., (2007) further argues that "policy is weakened by structural instability"; for instance, through pressure on public debt, the quality and rate of investments, etc., implying that over time, instability affects the ability of countries to respond to shocks through adequate policies.

Cali argues that trade flows in fragile countries are 'different', because they are i) larger than other external flows; and ii) particularly volatile, partly due to their concentration in primary commodities. Both factors would amplify the impact of changes in trade flows in fragile contexts. Trade flows in the g7+ LDCs seem to reflect these conditions.

Using the LDC Group as a comparator, Figure 4.2 shows that the relative importance of trade for the g7+ LDCs is higher, not falling below 70% of external finance over the past ten years. Figure 4.3 presents the export concentration index for the g7+ LDCs and the LDCs. The Figure indicates that the export concentration of all g7+ LDCs is overall higher than the average for the LDCs and that, whereas the LDCs have reduced the level of concentration of their exports since 2006 on average, the export concentration of the g7+ LDCs has not significantly changed over time, with the exception of Yemen. Table 4.A5 in the Annex presents the top three exports of the g7+ LDCs. These represent at least 40% of total merchandise exports for all these countries, reaching 99% for South Sudan. Finally, Figure 4.1 (above) shows the annual variation in the commodities price index. It shows that over the period from 2006 to 2017, the price of fuels has been particularly erratic. The exposure of g7+ LDCs to trade flows and their volatility suggests that changes in trade flows can have particularly destabilizing effects in these countries.

Figure 4.2. Trade, remittances and FDI flows to the LDCs and the g7+ LDCs, 2006-2017



Source: World Bank (2019, 2019a, 2019b), (accessed February 2019).


StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953261

The destabilizing effects associated with the volatility of export revenue can be buffeted against through different mechanisms, including stabilization funds that would allow smoothing investment and consumption in periods of low prices. To reduce the incentive to capture the control of the valuable resource, such as oil or other point source commodities, efforts should be directed to enhancing accountability and transparency around natural resource management.

A complementary, more structural response would consist of diversifying production and exports away from primary commodities – particularly agriculture and mining – so as to reduce the *exposure* to risks associated with trade flow fluctuations, thus building resilience to external shocks (Koren, M., and S. Tenreyro 2007 and Papageorgiou 2012).

However, economic specialization in natural resources does not doom countries to conflict, as the experience of resource-rich countries such as Botswana, Chile and others would suggest. Neither would economic diversification be enough in itself to eliminate the risk of conflict. Violence and conflict result from the interaction of a number of socio-economic, institutional, political and other factors of a contextual nature that mediate how particular events, including changes in trade flows, may influence violence and conflict.

Figure 4.3. Export concentration in the g7+ LDCs



Note: Higher index values denote higher concentration of exports in a few products.

Source: UNCTADstat database (accessed February 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953280

Inequality – especially horizontal inequality – and exclusion can create a fertile ground upon which to build grievances that undermine social cohesion and lead to violence (United Nations/World Bank, 2018). Horizontal inequalities refer to uneven access to opportunities; resources such as land and other natural resources; and group-specific differences in standards of living, etc., which can create feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction, leading to group mobilization and violence (Stewart, F., 2008).

The existence of high unemployment or underemployment, particularly of youth, has been associated with a higher risk of conflict. The lack of economic opportunities and underlying economic and political barriers to youth participation in society may create a sense of alienation and make youth vulnerable to mobilization in violence to secure a livelihood (Stewart, F., 2008). Economic diversification may reduce the opportunity cost of resorting to violence by increasing employment opportunities in alternative sectors, including for youth, further discussed in Chapter 8.

Inclusion, on the other hand, helps prevent conflict, stop it and avoid its escalation or recurrence (Paffenholz et. al., 2017). Creating space for the economic, social and political participation of youth and women could further contribute to greater stability (United Nations/World Bank, 2018).

Export revenues constitute a major source of external finance to the g7+ LDCs, and the concentration of their exports in very few products of relatively high volatility make them vulnerable to external shocks. The composition of exports in certain valuable commodities may provide incentives to fight for, as well as undermine state institutions and thus the quality of public policies, including to promote a good business environment for the development of the private sector and to promote economic diversification. Whether instability arising from fluctuations in trade flows translates into conflict depends, however, on contextual factors. Policies that promote inclusion and reduce inequality would enhance the resilience of countries and societies to the risk of conflict.

AID FOR TRADE TO SUPPORT ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION IN THE LDCs

> *"The capacity of Chad to expand its production of goods and services is fundamental to strengthening both domestic and international trade with all the benefits that this can bring for boosting public revenues and job creation. Aid for trade plays a vital role in strengthening human capital, institutions and infrastructure and supporting the private sector in order to achieve the objectives of sustainable development.*
> – H.E. Mahamat Hamid Koua, *Minister of Oil and Energy on behalf of the Minister of Mining, Trade and Industrial Development, and Promotion of the Private Sector*

Aid for Trade


The international community has been assisting developing countries' and the LDCs' own efforts towards economic diversification and structural transformation through development programmes, including aid for trade. Since 2006, over USD 400 billion of ODA has been disbursed to build trade capacity in developing countries and the LDCs.

This Section reviews aid-for-trade flows to the LDCs and the g7+ LDCs seen from the prism of economic diversification.

> *"As a key priority for Comoros, further efforts on economic diversification aim at broadening the export base of three main export products, meeting the domestic demand, while targeting regional markets".* – Comoros, OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019).

The LDCs account for 27% of total aid for trade. They are the second largest aid-for-trade recipients, 12% behind lower-middle income countries. aid for trade to the LDCs follows the same pattern as total aid for trade: for the past five years, commitments have fluctuated, but disbursements have remained stable. Commitments to the LDCs increased by 28% in 2017, after a fall in 2016 (Figure 4. 4). The LDCs in Africa account for 63% of aid for trade to the LDCs since 2006. The g7+ LDCs represent close to a quarter of total aid for trade to the LDCs, with flows remaining broadly stable since 2009.

Figure 4.4. Aid-for-trade flows to the LDCs and the g7+ LDCs, average 2006-2017




Source: OECD-DAC CRS, aid activity database (2019), (accessed April 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953299

Aid for trade is unevenly distributed among the LDCs. The top five recipients – Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Tanzania – account for over 40% of total aid-for-trade disbursements to the LDCs between 2006 and 2017. Four of the g7+ LDCs - Afghanistan, DRC, Haiti and Yemen - receive over half the aid for trade to the group.

The picture is more nuanced when looking at flows per capita: Small Islands Developing States (SIDSs) and Timor-Leste come on top and significantly above the LDC's average, due to the small size of their population and the fact that the cost of aid delivery is inherently more expensive in geographically dispersed populations (OECD, 2018) (Figure 4.5). Per capita aid-for-trade allocations to most of the g7+ LDCs are below the LDCs' average. The responses to the OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019) from Burundi, CAR, and Comoros acknowledge limited progress in economic diversification, due to insufficient aid-for-trade financing.

Figure 4.5. Aid-for-trade disbursements to the g7+ LDCs, per capita, 2013-2017




Source: OECD-DAC CRS, aid activity database (2019); World Bank (2019d), (accessed April 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953318

A few development partners account for most aid for trade to the LDCs. The World Bank, Japan, the United States of America (USA) and the European Union account for over 60% of aid-for-trade disbursements to the LDCs since 2006. The World Bank, USA, and EU are the top providers of aid for trade to g7+ LDCs, representing 70% of disbursements over the same period.

Most of the aid for trade to the LDCs goes to infrastructure. Infrastructure (55%) and building productive capacity (43%) account for most of the aid-for-trade disbursements to the LDCs. Disbursements to the g7+ LDCs follow a similar pattern with infrastructure representing 56% of aid for trade to these countries (Figure 4.6). Support for trade policy and regulations, including trade facilitation, represent 2% and 3% in the LDCs and the g7+ LDCs, respectively, over the same period. The share of trade-related adjustment remains extremely limited.

Figure 4.6. Disbursements by aid-for-trade category, 2006-2017



Source: OECD-DAC CRS, aid activity database (2019), (accessed April 2019).


StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953337

The LDCs identify infrastructure as a major constraint to economic diversification in the OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019), followed by access to finance (LDCs) and high trade costs (g7+ LDCs).

> *"Support should be directed more towards promoting access to finance and strengthening the country's productive and trade capacities."* – Togo, OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019).

The DTISs of g7+ LDCs produced under the aegis of the EIF[4] , on the other hand, underscore the need for technical assistance to improve trade policy formulation and implementation and to undertake trade facilitation reforms in these countries (Figure 4.7).

Figure 4.7. DTIS Action Matrices: mapping priorities of the g7+LDCs



Source: EIF, Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953356

Transport and storage receive the largest share of aid-for-trade disbursements to LDCs – over 30% since 2006, followed by agriculture (Box 4.5). The sector allocation to the g7+ LDCs is similar, though transport and storage, and business and other services are relatively more important in these countries than in the LDCs as a whole. (Figure 4.8)


Box 4.5. Strengthening value addition of main cash crops in Comoros

In Comoros, close to half of the population works in harvesting, processing and exporting three cash crops: ylang-ylang, clove and vanilla. These three products account for 80% of the country's exports. Cooperation between UNDP, ITC and the EIF has offered new opportunities for ylang-ylang farmers, distillers and small entrepreneurs in Comoros. Today, they are better organized in different cooperatives, working together to improve productivity and increase income.

A newly established ylang-ylang cooperative includes 250 female ylang-ylang pickers, 50 planters and 47 male distillers. In addition, small companies similar to Nectalab can now create greater value addition in the country with essential oils and beauty products produced directly in Comoros. The results in the vanilla sector are gaining scale through the Comoros Integrated Trade Programme of the Islamic International Trade Finance Corporation.

Source: Adapted from the Comoros DTIS (2015) and the OECD/WTO aid-for-trade monitoring exercise (2019) of Comoros.

Figure 4.8. Top sectors in the LDCs supported through aid for trade, 2006-2017



Source: OECD-DAC CRS, aid activity database (2019), (accessed February 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953375


Supporting the economic foundations of the g7+ LDCs

Close to 60% of total ODA to the g7+ LDCs since 2006 have financed interventions associated with the peacebuilding and statebuilding goals.[5] In terms of the breakdown across the PSGs, the biggest investments are made on economic foundations and revenue and services, but these flows are relatively more important in the LDCs than in the g7+ LDCs. This may be explained by the fact that these PSGs "cover many areas of standard development practice around economic growth [and that] it is easier to implement more larger-scale projects where fragility is absent" (OECD, 2018) (Figure 4.9).

Conversely, the PSGs related to legitimate politics, security and justice receive relatively larger investments in the g7+ LDCs than in the LDCs as a whole. This suggests a certain prioritization of these PSGs by the g7+ LDCs, which have committed with their partners. Whether the right amount of financing is being provided to the PSGs as a whole and to each of them individually is a highly contextual issue, since programming costs as well as the needs across dimensions of fragility are context-specific (OECD, 2018).

Nevertheless, the weight of humanitarian aid to the g7+ LDCs in total development assistance has gradually increased since 2006, reaching 29% on average in 2017. The increase in humanitarian aid and other trends in ODA has reduced the global amount of programmable aid, which fell below the 50% threshold in 2015 (United Nations, 2018). This overall trend is of concern for the LDCs and fragile contexts, since ODA is critical to support strategic investments for SDG attainment in these countries.

Figure 4.9. Breakdown of ODA to the New Deal's Peace Building and State Building Goals, by PSG, g7+ LDCs, 2006-2017



Source: OECD-DAC CRS, aid activity database (2019), (accessed February 2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953394

Support economic diversification in the g7+ LDCs through aid for trade

In countries affected by fragility and conflict, reducing instability linked to trade shocks may contribute to reducing violence and conflict, which is associated with the importance of valuable extractive commodities in the economic and trade profile of these countries. However, triggering economic diversification and structural transformation in these contexts is especially challenging.

In fragile and conflict-affected contexts, physical infrastructure and security represent major constraints to the activation of the private sector, but government policy and regulations also play an important role. At the same time, advancing policy and institutional reforms in fragile and conflict affected environments can be polarizing and face more fundamental resistance than is expected in any change process on regular development situations. A good understanding of the political economy of reforms and dynamics surrounding reforms is necessary.

The private sector can have predatory effects in weak institutional environments (Utterwulghe, S., 2014). Policy and regulatory efforts can, for example, direct firm incentives towards productive rather than rent seeking activities and improve transparency; supporting small- and medium-sized enterprises and microenterprises that make up most enterprises in low income countries, help sharing more broadly the benefits of economic growth. Establishing "equitable oversight mechanisms regarding the use and management of extractives [. . .] can offset tensions; the role of the private sector is essential" (United Nations/World Bank, 2018).

The rapid expansion of productive jobs is critical for stabilization, long-term development and economic empowerment (Box 4.6). Citing evidence from programmes and research on fragile and conflict affected environments, Dubwick, N., et. al. (2013) argue for a more purposeful approach to job creation in fragile and conflict affected contexts, which would require changing traditional sequencing of interventions that seek improving policy and macroeconomic environments, the rule of law, etc., *before* the launching of private sector development programmes. An approach that works rather in parallel would be desirable. The UN policy on post-conflict employment espouses this approach through work on three tracks: i) stabilization of income generation and emergency employment; ii) local economic recovery for employment opportunities and reintegration; and iii) sustainable employment creation and decent work (United Nations, 2009). The three tracks work in parallel, though not with the same intensity, which varies over time as needs on the ground evolve from crisis towards resilience as per the g7+ LDCs spectrum.

Box 4.6. New employment opportunities in the g7+ LDCs: roads for development in Timor-Leste

2017 marked an important achievement for the international development community in responding to a growing attention to fragile contexts – the adoption of the Recommendation 205 "Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience" by the International Labor Organization (ILO). Recommendation 205 has replaced Recommendation 71 "Transition from War to Peace" adopted after the Second World War and which included the dimension of internal conflict. The new Recommendation focuses on recovery and reconstruction in post-conflict situations, addressing root causes of fragility, and building resilience. It calls for greater international cooperation, coordination and coherence. It also stresses employment promotion, capacity development and institutional strengthening. Building on this recommendation, ILO's Jobs for Peace and Resilience programme focuses on job creation, skills development and entrepreneurship, thereby contributing to social cohesion.

Since 2012, Timor-Leste, supported by Australia and the ILO, has successfully built over 300 kilometres of rural roads and rehabilitated more than one quarter, thereby helping to connect the remote areas of the country to the markets, improving access to schools and hospitals and ensuring much-needed jobs. With the renewed commitment to further boosting road connectivity, the Government of Timor-Leste is funding all the remaining road works, while Australia continues to support the ILO's technical assistance in the country until 2021.

Over the years, 14 g7+ LDCs have benefitted from the ILO's support, including Afghanistan, Burundi, CAR, Comoros, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Haiti, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan and Timor-Leste.

Source: Adapted from ILO (2017), (2017a).

Value chains can help restore market links and build trust among different social groups (UNDESA, 2010). A USAID synthesis report on lessons from value chain programmes in conflict-affected environments underscores the same point, noting that trust-building activities, such as associations or value chain working groups, are useful in building trust and linkages among firms related horizontally and vertically in the chain.

However, the integration into global value chains increases the exposure to external shocks, as the location of tasks along the value chain in different geographies is dynamic based on lead firms' assessments of relative production costs across locations (UNCTAD, 2013).

Value chains may also increase inequality, if they exclude segments of the population, notably small farmers or those relatively isolated or who lack the productive assets to be able to participate. To enhance the contribution of programmes towards resilience, the programme design should rather seek to create opportunities for the poor, especially youth and those affected by conflict.

Aid for trade to the LDCs and the g7+ LDCs is supporting the development of productive capacity and infrastructure in these countries, which are important for economic diversification. More than a third of investments are concentrated in the agriculture sector, which is critical for poverty reduction, and represent a path towards economic diversification in low income countries. Nevertheless, a more balanced sector distribution of aid for trade can support diversification through promising options outside of agriculture as well. Aid for trade is highly concentrated in a few LDCs, and while total aid-for-trade disbursements to the LDCs have gradually increased, Aid-for-trade disbursements to the g7+ LDCs have remained stable for the past five years. The per capita allocations to most of the g7+ LDCs are below the LDCs average.

Supporting economic diversification in the g7+ LDCs can make a contribution to stability and peace and the achievement of the SDGs. However, triggering economic transformation through economic diversification in fragile contexts is particularly complex. Programmes in such environments should be especially sensitive to the political economy of reforms. Emphasis on employment creation, including through targeted sector and value chain programmes that help build trust across actors, may be particularly useful. The involvement of local stakeholders, including youth, women and people affected by conflict and fragility, is essential to build resilience and avoid conflict recurrence.

CONCLUSIONS

As a contribution to the reflections on the importance of economic diversification for sustainable development and the role of aid for trade, this chapter has focused on the specific circumstances of the LDCs. A key finding is that the lack of economic and export diversification is at the heart of the structural vulnerability of LDC economies and has serious implications for the ability of these countries to sustain economic growth that creates opportunities for all, thereby reducing poverty and inequality. Shifting resources from low productivity to high productivity activities in agriculture, services and manufacturing will support higher economic growth and convergence towards higher income levels in the LDCs. Public investments in infrastructure and human capital are important, as are policy reforms that create a propitious environment for private productive investment and targeted policies to promote sectors with the potential for diversification and employment creation.

An additional finding is that efforts towards economic and export diversification in the g7+ LDCs has the additional benefit of supporting stability and promoting inclusion to the extent that economic diversification creates better livelihoods and employment for the population, especially youth and women, as well as those affected by conflict. But promoting economic diversification in fragile contexts is particularly challenging due to political polarization and weak institutional environments and capacity resulting from fragility and conflict. Programmes to support economic and export diversification need to be cognizant of political economy sensitivities and build coalitions towards reforms that contribute to productive economic activities by the private sector, employment creation and poverty reduction.

Finally, the analysis finds that aid for trade is supporting the LDCs' own efforts to diversify their economies and exports through investments into infrastructure and productive capacities. Nevertheless, the stagnation of aid for trade to LDCs and g7+ LDCs and its high concentration in a few countries poses questions regarding the adequate level of flows to these countries.Aid for trade per capita to most of the g7+ LDCs, which find themselves in fragile situations, is below the LDC average. In this context, increasing aid for trade to the LDCs in line with international commitments would be important.

In addressing the risks of violence, it is necessary to better align humanitarian, development and peacebuilding efforts. Aid-for-trade programmes in fragile situations should be particularly sensitive to the way that programmes may interact with the local context and support the broader statebuilding and peacebuilding efforts. In the g7+ LDCs, a certain prioritization is these areas is taking place.

NOTES

1. We would like to thank Frans Lammersen and Rachel Scott for the strategic guidance and Aussama Bejraoui for sharing the latest Aid for Trade data (OECD), Ratnakar Adhikari (EIF), Michael Roberts and Evgeniia Shannon (WTO), David Kucera (ILO), and Riad Meddeb from UNDP for their valuable comments.
2. Bangladesh, Bhutan, Kiribati, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Nepal, São Tomé and Príncipe, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste and Tuvalu.
3. The Aggregated LPI combines the results of the six components over the last four surveys into one single measure; https://lpi.worldbank.org/.
4. Based on the DTISs of 16 g7+ LDCs. The DTIS of Somalia is being planned, while the development of the DTIS of CAR has been put on hold.
5. This analysis is based on the OECD States of Fragility 2018 categorization of CRS codes according to the PSGs. See: http://www.oecd.org/dac/states-of-fragility-2018-9789264302075-en.htm.

REFERENCES

Andreoni, A., and C.L. Gomez (2012). Can we live on services? Exploring manufacturing-services interfaces and their implications for industrial policy design. http://druid8.sit.aau.dk/acc_papers/j2uc1c7qnybes5rm57hueffrhhaj.pdf, accessed 04 March 2019.

Cali, M. (2015). *Trading away from conflict. Using trade to increase resilience in fragile states*, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Collier, P., and A. Hoeffle (2004). 'Aid, Policy and Growth in Post-Conflict Societies,' *European Economic Review*, 46 (8), 1475-500.

Dubwick, N., R. Srinivasan, J. Cuesta and D. Madani (2013). *Creating jobs in Africa's Fragile States. Are value chains the answer?*, World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Guerrieri, P., and V. Meliciani (2005). Technology and international competitiveness: The interdependence between manufacturing and producer services. Structural Change and Economic Dynamics, 16(4), 489–502.

Guillaumont, P., and S. Guillaumont Jeanneney. *State fragility and economic vulnerability: what is measured and why?*. 2009.18.2011.

Hidalgo, C.A., B. Klinger, A.-L. Barabasi and R. Hausmann (2007). 'The product space conditions the development of nations', *Science*, 317-482-7.

Hoeffler, A.,(1999). *Challenges of Infrastructure Rehabilitation and Reconstruction in War-affected Economies,* Background document for the African Development Bank Report, REP/ 2000-2.

ILO,(2017). Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 (No. 205). ILO. Geneva. https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:R205, accessed 01 March 2019.

ILO (2017a). *Rural Road development for better rural employment and economy*, ILO, Geneva https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/---ilo-jakarta/documents/publication/wcms_548653.pdf, accessed 15 February 2019.

IRAM (2013). Appuyer la transition vers une filière gomme arabique plus durable, Institut de recherches et d'applications des méthodes de développement. IRAM. https://www.iram-fr.org/ouverturepdf.php?file=628-1485716241.pdf., accessed 15 February 2019.

ITC (2017). Rapport final: projet de renforcement des capacités commerciales de la filière gomme arabique tchadienne (PRCCFGAT), ITC, Geneva.

ITU (2018). Achieving universal and affordable internet in the Least Developed Countries. ICTs, LDCs and the SDGs, ITU.

Koren, M., and S. Tenreyro (2007). 'Volatility and Development', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 122, 243-287.

Kucera D., X. Jiang (2018). Structural transformation in emerging economies: leading sectors and the balanced growth hypothesis, Oxford Development Studies. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2018.1533934 , accessed 04 March 2019.

McKechnie, A., A. Lightner, and D.W. te Velde (2018). Economic Development in Fragile contexts. Learning from success and failure, ODI, https://set.odi.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/SET-Econ-Development-in-Fragile-States_Final-report.pdf.

McMillan, M., J. Page, D. Booth and D.W. te Velde (2017). *Supporting economic transformation: An approach paper.* Supporting Economic Transformation Report, Overseas Development Institute, London.

Mishra, S., S. Lundstrom and R. Anand (2011). *Services Export Sophistication and Economic Growth*, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRANETTRADE/Resources/Internal-Training/287823-1285275962946/Service_Export_Growth.pdf., accessed 10 February 2019.

OECD (2018). *States of Fragility 2018*, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264302075-en, accessed 11 February 2019.

Paffenholz, T., A. Hirblinger, D. Landau, F. Fritsch and C. Dijkstra (2017). 'Preventing Violence through Inclusion: From Building Political Momentum to Sustaining Peace.' Background paper for the United Nations–World Bank Flagship Study, *Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict*, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Papageorgiou, C., and S. Nikola (2012). Economic Diversification in LDCs: Stylized Facts and Macroeconomic Implications, IMF Staff Discussion Note, SDN/12/13, IMF.

Parker, J.C. (2008). *A synthesis of practical lessons from value chain projects in conflict-affected environments*, microREPORT#105, USAID, Washington, DC.

Rodrik, D. (2013). 'Unconditional convergence in manufacturing', *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 165-204.

Sinha, S., J. Holmberg and T. Mark (2013). What works for market development: A review of the evidence, UTV Working Paper 2013:1, Sida.

Stewart, F., and J.F.E. Ohiorhenuam (2008), *Post-conflict economic recovery. Enabling local ingenuity*, UNDP, New York.

UNCTAD (2013). *Global Value Chains and Development. investment and value-added trade in the global economy,* United Nations, https://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/diae2013d1_en.pdf, accessed 20 February 2019.

UNCTAD (2014). The Least Developed Report 2014. *Growth with structural transformation: A post-2015 development agenda*, United Nations, https://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/ldc2014_en.pdf , accessed 20 February 2019.

UNCTAD (2015). *The Least Developed Report 2015. Transforming rural economies*, United Nations, https://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/ldc2015_en.pdf. accessed 20 February 2019.

UNCTAD (2016). *The Least Developed Report 2016. The path to graduation and beyond: Making the most of the process.* United Nations, https://unctad.org/en/pages/PublicationWebflyer.aspx?publicationid=1664. accessed 20 February 2019.

UNCTAD (2017). Improving implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action, goals and targets related to productive capacities and doubling the share of the least developed countries in global exports, TD/B/C.I/EM.9/2, United Nations, https://unctad.org/meetings/en/SessionalDocuments/ciem9d2_en.pdf , accessed 20 February 2019.

UNCTAD (2018). Statistical Tables in the LDCs Report 2018. https://unctad.org/en/Pages/ALDC/Least%20Developed%20Countries/LDC-Statistics.aspx., accessed 15 February 2019.

UNDP, (2018). *Human Development Indices and Indicators*. 2018 Statistical Update, UNDP, New York.

United Nations (2009). *Policy for Post-conflict employment creation, income generation and reintegration*, United Nations, Geneva.

United Nations (2018). *Handbook on the Least Developed Country Category: Inclusion, Graduation, and Special Support Measures*, Third Edition, committee of Development Policy and United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York.

United Nations and World Bank (2018). *Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict*, World Bank, Washington, DC. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28337. , accessed 10 February 2019.

Utterwulghe, S. (2014), *Fostering Private Sector Development in Fragile States: A Piece of Cake?*, https://blogs.worldbank.org/psd/water/fostering-private-sector-development-fragile-states-piece-cake accessed 20 February 2019.

World Bank (2019). Trade (% of GDP), https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/ne.trd.gnfs.zs, (accessed 20 February 2019).

World Bank (2019a). Personal remittances, received (% of GDP), https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/bx.trf.pwkr.dt.gd.zs (accessed 20 February 2019).

World Bank (2019b). Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP), https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/bx.klt.dinv.wd.gd.zs (accessed 20 February 2019).

WTO (2017). Ministerial Declaration adopted at the first meeting of Trade Ministers of the g7+ WTO Accessions Group, WTO/MIN (17)/51.

WTO (2018), Market access for products and services of export interest to LDCs, Sub-Committee on Least developed countries, Note by the Secretariat, WTO, Geneva, 2 October 2018, WT/COMTD/LDC/W/66.

ANNEX

Table 4.A1. Employment by sector in the LDCs, selected years (percent of total employment)

Country Category	Employment in Agriculture		Employment in Industry		Employment in Manufacturing		Employment in Services	
	2000	2017	2000	2017	2000	2017	2000	2017
G7+ LDCs	66.9	60.9	9.3	10.5	6.0	6.4	23.7	28.5
LDCs*	72.7	60.2	8.6	12.6	6.2	7.8	18.7	27.2
ODC	43.8	26.4	22.3	23.9	16.7	13.9	33.9	49.7

Notes: * LDC aggregates excluding Kiribati and Tuvalu, for which data is unavailable

Source: ILOstat – Trends Econometric Models, ILO estimates and projections (accessed November 2018). Taken from UNCTAD Statistical Tables of the LDC Report 2018.

Table 4.A2. Product composition of merchandise exports, 2015-2017 (USD millions and percent)

Country	Total Exports (USD million)	PRIMARY COMMODITIES				MANUFACTURED GOODS					Unallocated
		Total	Food and Agriculture	Fuels	Minerals, Ores and Metals	Total	Labour-intensive and Resource-intensive Manufactures	Low-skill and Technology-intensive Manufactures	Medium-skill and Technology-intensive Manufactures	High-skill and Technology-intensive Manufactures	
LDCs	**153,328.9**	**64.2**	17.0	28.0	19.2	**35.1**	29.7	1.5	1.5	2.8	0.7
African LDCs and Haiti	90,047.3	90.2	18.9	41.6	29.6	9.4	4.0	1.1	1.4	3.1	0.5
Asian LDCs	62,723.3	26.8	13.7	8.7	4.4	72.3	66.9	2.0	1.5	2.4	0.9
Island LDCs	558.3	89.1	82.9	2.2	4.0	6.7	1.8	2.7	0.8	1.8	4.2
ODCs	**7,280,988.1**	**28.5**	8.7	13.1	6.8	70.8	14.4	6.9	19.6	32.2	0.7

Note: Data based on UNCTAD merchandise trade matrix, including estimates values.
Source: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat database (accessed November 2018).

Table 4.A3. Product composition of merchandise imports , 2015-2017 (USD millions and percent)

Country	Total Exports (USD million)	PRIMARY COMMODITIES				MANUFACTURED GOODS					Unallocated
		Total	Food and Agriculture	Fuels	Minerals, Ores and Metals	Total	Labour-intensive and Resource-intensive Manufactures	Low-skill and Technology-intensive Manufactures	Medium-skill and Technology-intensive Manufactures	High-skill and Technology-intensive Manufactures	
LDCs	**234,381.6**	**33.4**	19.7	10.7	3.0	**65.0**	18.6	10.9	21.5	17.8	1.7
African LDCs and Haiti	125,591.0	32.0	18.1	11.7	2.3	66.0	15.7	11.2	24.0	19.5	1.9
Asian LDCs	106,584.3	34.8	21.4	9.6	3.8	63.9	22.1	10.6	18.6	16.0	1.3
Island LDCs	2,206.2	40.5	29.7	9.7	1.1	53.5	13.0	12.1	19.8	12.3	6.0
ODCs	**6,789,945.3**	**30.7**	9.5	12.1	9.1	68.0	8.3	5.8	21.1	34.8	1.3

Note: Data based on UNCTAD merchandise trade matrix, including estimates values.
Source: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat database (accessed November 2018).

Table 4.A4. Access to electricity in the LDCs, selected years (percent of total population)

	Access to electricity, total		
	2000	**2010**	**2016**
g7+ LDCs	**15**	**26**	37
LDCs	20	33	45
ODCs	80	88	92

Source: World Bank, *WDI database* (accessed November 2018).

Table 4.A5. Top exports of g7+ LDCs *(continued on following page)*

Country	GDP per capita, USD	Top exports (HS4)	Share of total merchandise exports	Top imports	Top export markets	Top import origins
Afghanistan	1,940	Grapes, tropical fruits, insect resins	**40%**	Broadcasting equipment, wheat flours, peat	Pakistan, India, United Arab Emirates (UAE)	UAE, USA, Iran
Burundi	777	Gold, coffee, tea	**62%**	Refined petroleum, packaged medicaments, delivery tracks	UAE, Pakistan, Germany	Tanzania, Uganda, China
CAR	698	Rough wood, sawn woods, diamonds	**63%**	Cars, packaged medicaments, armored vehicles	France, Belarus, China	France, Japan, USA
Chad	1,990	Crude petroleum, gold, raw cotton	**92%**	Packaged medicaments, cars, wheat flour	USA, UAE, India	France, China, UAE
Comoros	1,520	Cloves, vanilla, essential oils	**90%**	Other furniture, used clothing, small iron containers	India, UAE, France	Tanzania, China, UAE
DRC	801	Refined copper, cobalt, copper ore	**64%**	Packaged medicaments, glass bottles, refined petroleum	China, Saudi Arabia, South Korea	China, South Africa, Belgium
Guinea	1,970	Gold, aluminium ore, petroleum gas	**88.2%**	Refined petroleum, rice, packaged medicaments	UAE, China, India	China, Netherlands, India
Guinea-Bissau	1,610	Coconuts, Brazil nuts and cashews, non-fillet frozen fish	**92%**	Refined petroleum, rice, malt extract	India, Belarus, Ghana	Portugal, The Gambia, Senegal
Haiti	1,780	Knit t-shirts, knit sweaters, non/knit men's suits	**71%**	Rice, knit t-shirts, light rubberized knitted fabric	USA, Dominican Republic, Mexico	Dominican Republic, USA, China

Table 4.A5. Top exports of g7+ LDCs *(continued from previous page)*

Country	GDP per capita, USD	Top exports (HS4)	Share of total merchandise exports	Top imports	Top export markets	Top import origins
Liberia	812	Passenger and cargo ships, gold, rubber	**75%**	Passenger and cargo ships, refined petroleum, boat propellers	Poland, UAE, Switzerland	South Korea, China, Japan
São Tomé and Príncipe	3,240	Cocoa beans, other iron products, iron structures	**69.7%**	Other sea vessels, cars, rice	Poland, Belgium, Spain	Portugal, South Africa, China
Sierra Leone	1,480	Iron ore, titanium ore diamonds	**54%**	Rice, packaged medicaments, cars	China, Belgium, Ivory Coast	China, USA, India
Solomon Islands	2,240	Rough wood, processed fish, palm oil	**79.6%**	Refined petroleum, rice, cars	China, India, Italy	Australia, China, Singapore
Somalia	434	Sheep and goat, bovine, insect resins	**79%**	Raw sugar, rice, rubber footwear	Oman, UAE, Hong Kong, China	UAE, India, China
South Sudan	994	Crude petroleum, other oily seeds	**99%**	Raw sugar, packaged medicaments, cars	China, Algeria, Pakistan	Uganda, China, Pakistan
Timor-Leste	2,140	Crude petroleum, coffee, used clothing	**89.2%**	Delivery tracks, cars, cement	Thailand, USA, Singapore	Indonesia, China, Singapore
Togo	1,490	Gold, cement, refined petroleum	**40%**	Refined petroleum, motorcycles, crude petroleum	UAE, Benin, Lebanon	China, Belgium, Netherlands
Yemen, Rep. of	2,510	Gold, crude petroleum, other fruits	**75.3%**	Wheat, refined petroleum, raw sugar	Oman, UAE, China	China, Turkey, Oman

Source: MIT, 2019, https://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/.

CHAPTER 5

ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION: LESSONS FROM PRACTICE


Contributed by the World Bank Group[1]

Abstract: *Economic diversification remains a challenge for most developing countries and is arguably greatest for countries with the lowest incomes as well as for those whose economies are small, landlocked and/or dominated by primary commodity dependence. For such countries, economic diversification is inextricably linked with the structural transformation of their economies and the achievement of higher levels of productivity resulting from the movement of economic resources within and between economic sectors. Rooted in examples of World Bank Group support, this chapter traces the boundaries of any discussion of economic diversification by advancing a definition that encompasses two related dimensions of diversification: (i) trade diversification (i.e. exporting new or better products, or to new markets) and (ii) domestic production diversification (i.e. cross-sectoral rebalancing of output, driving the reallocation of resources across industries and within industries between firms to increase total factor productivity). The chapter raises awareness on the complexity of the diversification process and the state of knowledge surrounding economic diversification. While the current global environment creates challenges for poor, small, landlocked and/or resource-dependent countries, a range of new diversification routes can be followed. This however requires that policy attention be paid to four key determinants of successful diversification strategies, which development partners and International Organisations can support through targeted Aid for Trade interventions. These are: (i) the supply of appropriate incentive frameworks; (ii) investments and policy reforms targeted at reducing trade costs; (iii) effective policies to support adjustment and the reallocation of resources towards new activities; and (iv) government interventions directed at specific market, policy and institutional failures.*

WHY ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION MATTERS

Economic diversification is a key element of economic development in which a country moves to a more diverse production and trade structure. A lack of economic diversification is often associated with increased vulnerability to external shocks that can undermine prospects for longer-term economic growth. The world's poorest countries, many of which are often small or geographically remote, landlocked and/or heavily dependent on primary agriculture or minerals, tend to have the most concentrated economic structures. This creates challenges in terms of exposure to sector-specific shocks, such as weather-related events in agriculture or sudden price shocks for minerals.

Figure 5.1. Export diversification in Sub-Sharan Africa, 2017



Source: Authors' calculations.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953413

Growth also tends to be unbalanced in the case of mineral dependent countries or slow and difficult to sustain in agrarian ones. Poverty-reducing, trade-driven, growth has been particularly difficult to achieve in countries whose economies are heavily dependent upon primary commodities. Countries whose geography implies a punishing lack of connectivity to regional or world markets are also at a distinct disadvantage in attempting to diversify their product and export mix. Figures 5.1 and 5.2 offer a snapshot of diversification levels across regions of the developing world, using Herfindhal-Hirschman indices of market concentration.[2]

Figure 5.2. Export diversification in selected developing country regions, 2017

(Continued on following page)





Figure 5.2. Export diversification in selected developing country regions, 2017

(Continued from previous page)

Export diversification (HHI) - East Asia Pacific, 2017



Export diversification (HHI) - Middle East and North Africa, 2017





Figure 5.2. Export diversification in selected developing country regions, 2017

(Continued from previous page)



Source: Authors' calculations.


StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953432

Diversification helps to manage volatility and provide a more stable path for equitable growth and development. Successful diversification is all the more important now in the wake of slowing global growth and the imperative in many developing countries to increase the number and quality of jobs. Trade expansion is central to creating new, higher productivity, jobs that will facilitate growth through structural transformation. Moving labour from low productivity employment, mainly in agriculture, to higher productivity jobs in a range of mostly urban activities characterised by strong agglomeration economies is imperative for sustained growth. Countries in East Asia made such a growth transition in the 1990's through reliance on exports of labour-intensive manufactures. The challenge today for many developing countries is not only to grow labour-intensive manufacturing, but also value-adding agri-business, horticulture, and selected services, activities that are all at once labour-intensive, tradable and value-adding. While rapid increases in working populations offer many developing countries an opportunity for a demographic dividend, reaping it may remain challenging in the absence of economic diversification and job-producing private sector growth. The need for government action through well designed public investments and effective policy reforms that support a more diversified economy remains centrally important.

Economic diversification and structural transformation – the movement of factors of production within and across different sectors towards higher productivity uses - are closely linked phenomena. Structural transformation can refer to the shift from agricultural to non-agricultural sectors, or from manufacturing to services. A broad and well documented trend has been the gradual decline in the importance of agriculture accompanied by an initial increase followed by decline in manufactures and a corresponding increase in services that consistently shows across many countries as a part of the process of economic development (Herrendorf, Rogerson and Valentinyi, 2014). Such a trend is perhaps most visible in global labour markets.

The share of agriculture in total employment has been shrinking across all country income groups. Globally, it has contracted by close to a third, from 44 per cent in 1991 to 28 per cent in 2018, with the largest contribution attributable to middle-income countries (see Figure 5.3).[3] The share of employment in manufacturing has also been decreasing globally and is down slightly from 16 percent in 1991 to 14 percent in 2018, a trend driven primarily by high-income countries, where advanced robotics and the adoption of other labour-saving technologies has made the greatest headway (World Bank, 2017). The sectors in which the most significant employment expansion has occurred in recent decades all relate to services, with construction, non-market (public) services and, most importantly, a host of market services leading the way (ILO, 2019).

Figure 5.3. Distribution of employment by aggregate sectors, global and country income groupings, 1991 and 2018 (percentages)



Source: ILO (2019)

Efforts at economic diversification could be made more daunting if new technologies and automation encourage a reshoring of manufacturing production to developed economies. However technological change and globalisation are also generating new opportunities for resources to shift within agriculture to higher productivity activities, and services as well as manufacturing can drive diversification and structural transformation (Hallward Driemeir and Nayaar, 2017). The recent years has seen countries at all levels of development witness a significant expansion of the role of services in their economies, with technological change a prime driver of what has come to be called the "servicification" of the world economy (National Board of Trade, 2010).

Technological innovations in services such as mobile communications and associated value-added services (e-commerce, e-payments), access to cloud computing and data storage are rapidly changing the very economics of services delivery and the geography of trade and investment in the sector. In the future, Baldwin (2018) describes 'virtual presence' technology and instant machine translation that could enable talented foreigners sitting abroad to provide services in offices and workspaces based in other countries. These developments hold potentially major welfare consequences for households, and for women in particular. They can greatly enhance the ability of small firms to contest markets and supply new products by improving access to information and the potential to deliver goods and services to consumers/buyers on a much greater scale. New technologies allow small firms to sell into global markets as well as to supply services to larger firms that participate in regional and global value chains and to domestic consumers (ITC, 2018). These trends illustrate the relevance of ongoing discussions on e-commerce and micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) in the World Trade Organization and their increasing prevalence in latest generation preferential trade agreements (PTAs).

Box 5.1. Chile and Zambia: contrasts in diversification trajectories

Chile and Zambia are both abundant in copper deposits and copper is both countries' main export product. They also share similar population size but differ significantly in their income levels. Chile's per capita income (PPP) is over USD 21,000 while Zambia's is just over USD 3,800. Fifty years ago, both countries produced similar amounts of copper. Both countries have also had similar patterns of copper deposit ownership, with their state-owned companies playing a major role. Yet their longer-term economic performance has been vastly different. Chile has steadily increased copper production while Zambia has remained stagnant, although there has been a recovery since 2000. Whereas Chile progressively lessened its level of resource-dependence, Zambia became more resource-dependent: copper currently represents 50% of Chilean exports while accounting for 80% of Zambian exports.

Chile followed a two-track diversification strategy: (i) diversification "*within*" industry (increasing value added in the copper industry by improving the quality of copper extraction and exporting processed products and complementing this with the development of domestic ancillary/logistics services; and (ii) diversification "*across*" industries (development of fisheries: high quality salmon exports, increasing exports of high value-added agricultural goods such as fruit and vegetables and wine production). In addition, Chile set up mechanisms that allowed it to save the rents from mineral extraction and invest in critical growth expenditures. Specifically: (i) a structural fiscal surplus rule that sterilizes the country's spending levels against copper fluctuations. This ensures macroeconomic stability and also generates accumulation of wealth when copper prices are high; and (ii) sovereign funds to administer the rents saved. Chile invested a significant amount of savings on training in advanced skills (i.e. scholarships to enroll Chileans into top global universities) and financing and mentoring to high growth start-up firms.

Unlike Chile, which enjoys a coastal location, Zambia is a landlocked country with high trade and transportation costs. Growth has not been inclusive and poverty in Zambia is widespread, with 61.2 percent of the population estimated to be living below the national poverty line. Sustained growth and continued political stability have produced only modest improvements in Zambian livelihoods. The effect of economic growth on overall poverty reduction has been small, as much of the benefits of growth have accrued to those already above the poverty line. Growth has been primarily driven by mining, construction, and financial services and has done little to create jobs and expand opportunities beyond the relatively small labour force already employed in these industries. Thus, for Zambia, economic diversification remains an essential objective to deliver more inclusive growth in the face of declining prices for copper, and to create employment for its fast growing, urban and youthful population.

Source: Meller and Simpasa (2011).

Despite its apparent economic benefits, not all developing countries have pursued diversification and fewer still have been successful in their efforts to overcome the dominance of natural resources and primary commodities or the shackles of geography. In many developing countries, the extractive industries sector is both shaped by and, in turn, influences political dynamics. A focus by policymakers on short-term rents from resources and their allocation to ensure political survival has sometimes distracted from policies and investments necessary to sustain growth in the long-term and has often been associated with increased internal conflict, with adverse effects for diversification. Nevertheless, some resource-rich countries have been able to diversify successfully. Resource rich countries can tax the rents from commodity extraction to fund critical investments in human capital, infrastructure and institutional assets. Box 5.1 showcases the contrasted diversification trajectories of Chile and Zambia.

DEFINING ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION

Economic diversification can be defined as the shift toward a more varied structure of domestic production and trade with a view to increasing productivity, creating jobs and providing the base for sustained poverty-reducing growth. *Domestic production diversification* results from the shift of domestic output across sectors, industries, and firms. It captures the dynamics of structural transformation, because successful diversification of domestic production entails resource reallocation across and/or within industries from low productivity activities to those with higher productivity. For its part, *trade diversification* occurs in three ways: (a) the export (or import) of new products (goods or services); (b) the export (or import) of existing products to new markets, and (c) the qualitative upgrading of exported (or imported) products.

Trade diversification, quality upgrading and the sectoral diversification of domestic production are often closely linked. Trade is often a key factor behind economic diversification. Indeed, integration into the global economy lies behind the success of countries in east Asia in diversifying into manufacturing which in turn has driven unprecedented poverty reduction. Export diversification is an objective in itself to reduce vulnerability to adverse terms of trade shocks and stabilise export revenues, as well as driving output diversification. Indeed, export diversification appears to be associated with less output volatility in low-income countries as well as faster sectoral reallocation. The empirical evidence also shows that quality upgrading of export products is closely correlated with greater impact of domestic production diversification on productivity growth (IMF, 2014).

Economic diversification is no longer seen as simply requiring the emergence of new industries. In the past, the focus was on the development of whole industries and the movement of resources between old (low productivity) and new (higher productivity) sectors. This typically required investments in all elements of production within a sector. There are today many more routes towards diversified economies.

Firstly, there has been an increasing focus on *firms* and firm-level characteristics and performance and the process of reallocation of resources between low productivity firms and high productivity firms, including within existing industries. For example, there is now a considerable body of evidence to suggest that within sectors, firms that export enjoy productivity and wage premia relative to those that do not. Secondly, technological change and the secular decline in transport costs has led to the splitting up of production and the emergence of regional and global value chains where distinct activities or tasks are undertaken in different countries according to where it is most efficient to locate activities and manage the value chain. Thirdly, pro-competitive regulatory reform and the decline of communication costs has enabled developing countries to greatly expand their participation in trade in services, many of which provide relatively high productivity activities compared to traditional agricultural or manufacturing activity. By supplying three in five jobs held by women worldwide, and four in five jobs within the G20 grouping accounting for 80 percent of global trade, the trend towards increasingly service-centric forms of development also shows important gains in inclusiveness (Lan and Shepherd, 2018; Sauvé, 2019).

The above considerations recall how concentrating on the output of manufacturing sectors may not be sufficient to identify the scope of opportunities for economic diversification. Furthermore, the splitting up of value chains implies that countries should not just be looking to exploit opportunities to produce and export final products but also exploring possibilities with regard to intermediate inputs. Diversifying the range and quality of imported inputs can support quality upgrading and productivity growth in existing sectors and allow new varieties of products to be developed. Producers of inputs can explore the densification of their value chains (diversification toward new uses of a given product) to access new markets and reduce vulnerability to product-specific shocks. This not only means a much richer menu for discussions on diversification but also the need for a more varied set of diversification metrics.

THE POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR DIVERSIFICATION

There is no magic recipe for diversification. There are, however, multiple paths to successful diversification. In countries at very low levels of economic development, the priority is typically to get the fundamentals right. As countries develop, multiple diversification paths may become available. Malaysia, for instance, was previously a primary commodity-based economy. Today it is integrated into global value chains across a wide range of (primarily manufacturing) industries, has expanded into new products and markets and upgraded the sophistication of its export mix. Chile opted for upgrading its traditional resource-dependent export industry (i.e., development of ancillary and logistics services to support the expansion of the copper exporting industry); and for domestic diversification toward new agricultural exports (i.e. development of the salmon and wine exporting industry). Long an exporter of a limited mix of agricultural commodities (bananas and unprocessed coffee), Costa Rica has made insertion in regional value chains and the attraction of FDI needed to sustain it a centerpiece of the country's development strategy over the past decades. At latest count, the country's export mix exceeded four thousand products, chief among which medical devices and IT components alongside a host of high value-added services. Much like Costa Rica, the United Arab Emirates are well-endowed with an efficient bureaucracy, stable macro-economic framework, good infrastructure, and a privileged location. It followed a diversification strategy focused on exporting new business services, exploiting agglomeration externalities and building a low-cost business platform (Gelb, 2010).

Everywhere, the trade and investment policy agenda lies at the heart of a strategy for economic diversification. Providing the foundations for structural transformation and private sector driven-growth is an essential element in achieving a broader base of economic activities. No country has experienced sustained growth and significant reduction in poverty without integrating into the global economy. Development partners can assist developing countries to put in place the following key basic elements:

(i) an appropriate incentive framework through reforms to the business and investment climate, reviewing trade and investment policies to remove bias against exporting and ensuring effective competition in product and factor markets and in key backbone services such as transportation, finance, energy and communications.

(ii) investments and policy reforms that reduce trade costs – declining trade costs and efficient trade logistics were at the heart of the success of East Asian countries in integrating into the global economy and achieving more diversified economies with not only more, but also better jobs.

(iii) effective policies to support adjustment and the reallocation of resources to new activities – from declining sectors but also from the informal sector and new entrants to the job market.

(iv) government interventions that target specific market, policy and institutional failures.

This approach provides an analytical base upon which a country can define a strategy to address the essential policy requirements for private-sector driven diversification. Each country should of course define its own route to a wider range of trade and production activities that reflects underlying endowments, comparative advantages and national characteristics, including the profile of poverty, availability of skills, institutions and governance conditions and prevailing political economy constraints. This will typically lead to a mix of cross-cutting, sector-focused and geographically targeted measures that will vary across countries, ideally defined in close consultation with the private sector (domestic and foreign) and regularly fine-tuned as the development process unfolds. For example, the route to diversification for a small resource-rich country with relatively high wages will likely be very different to that of a large resource rich country with low-wages.

The approach described above also provides a general step-wise sequencing of priority measures. The initial focus should be on addressing a country's incentive framework. There will be little point in investing heavily in infrastructure to reduce trade costs or in developing measures to support the movement of resources or targeting specific market failures if the incentive framework remains highly distorted and there is a strong bias against exports or if the sectors face significant entry barriers in the form of tariff or non-tariff barriers. In this case, active policies are likely to exacerbate the misallocation of resources. On the other hand, in countries that have been able to put in place an appropriate incentive structure and have efficient backbone services and relatively low trade costs, the policy focus can turn more to facilitating adjustment and targeting more specific market failures.

The sequencing of policies targeted at economic diversification should also take account of the implementation capacity of governments. For example, the implementation of industrial policies has often been undermined by imperfect knowledge of the externalities and spillovers that warrant sector specific interventions and the vulnerability of such interventions to corruption, manipulation, and rent-seeking conduct. Countries with weak institutions and limited capacity to implement complex policies, typically those with lower incomes, will tend to face greater risks when implementing industrial policies as opposed to focusing limited resources on removing disincentives to diversification and delivering essential public goods.

Countries with weak institutions often face significant political economy challenges in implementing a diversification strategy. Countries with a limited economic base, especially when dependent on high-value minerals, will often see political activities focused on rent-seeking behaviour and efforts to capture available economic rents. Despite strong economic arguments for the long-term benefits of diversification, this environment makes it difficult to implement necessary economic reforms. Successful strategies for diversification will therefore be based on a careful understanding of the underlying political environment, the main actors and how they wield power, the institutions that influence how that power is moderated and the potential impact of external factors, including regional institutions and partners such as the World Bank and other development agencies. For many countries, compliance with WTO disciplines, acceding to the world trade body, regional integration schemes and deep preferential agreements entered into with key trading partners can all represent powerful anchoring mechanisms to overcome domestic resistance to change by providing binding commitments that help to lock in reforms necessary for diversification.

Effective collaboration between development partners and international organisations is essential to support the implementation of a diversification strategy. There are a range of issues that require working together in partnership, for example, on addressing infrastructure constraints that raise trade and logistics costs in coordination with reforms that reduce trade barriers and increase competition among the providers of services along that trade-related infrastructure. The effective implementation of reforms that address policy failures requires a careful assessment of governance restrictions and political economy constraints. Efficient reallocation of resources across sectors or firms depends upon labour market policies and access to finance, among other issues.

THE INCENTIVE FRAMEWORK FOR DIVERSIFICATION

The World Bank Group's experience in advising governments on economic diversification suggests that there are three key areas of economic incentives that intersect to affect the framework for diversification. These are: i) business regulation and investment policy; ii) trade policy design; and iii) competition policy.

Business regulation and investment policy

Clear, transparent and predictable business regulation that provides a level playing field among investors - small and large, domestic and foreign - are essential for economic diversification. Business regulations such as those governing credit markets, the hiring and firing of workers, quality standards, the procedures and licenses required to start a business, contract enforcement and insolvency – all form an essential part of the incentive framework to encourage investment in new activities. In environments with a poor investment climate, the lack of competitive domestic suppliers, combined with inefficiencies in factor markets and institutional capacity constraints, hinder diversification (Farole and Winkler, 2012). There are three main ways in which business regulation and the investment climate condition the incentives towards diversification:

- *By reducing the costs of investing in new activities and by improving the efficiency by which resources move from declining firms and sectors towards more dynamic firms and sectors*. The time and cost of opening a business can affect entrepreneurship and the ability of firms to respond to emerging opportunities within existing and in new industries. Similarly, effective bankruptcy regimes that facilitate exit and encourage risk-taking constitute an important incentive for market entry. The effectiveness of entry and exit regulations can also foster competition among incumbent firms and their incentives to invest and innovate. Exit regulations affect how quickly resources trapped in unviable firms can be reallocated towards more efficient uses. Restrictive entry regulations disproportionally penalise industries characterised by greater experimentation, such as ICT-intensive sectors (Andrews and Cingano, 2014; Aghion et al., 2006).
- *By affecting day-to-day business operations and investment decisions*. These include tax regulation, credit market and labour market regulation. The extent to which these regulations are evenly applied matters for the efficiency with which resources are allocated across different sectors and firms. If discriminatory regulations allow less productive firms to survive and expand at the expense of more productive ones, diversification efforts will likely fail (Bartelsman *et al.*, 2010; Hseih and Klenow, 2009). Similar outcomes may arise when inefficient firms, including state-owned enterprises are propped up through distortive subsidy practices.
- *By proving a predictable and transparent business environment, reducing the risks associated with testing new products and markets*. Effective enforcement of rules and sound intellectual property rights enable firms to internalise the economic benefits of innovation, encouraging investment. A transparent and non-discriminatory regulatory environment, including appropriate investor protection laws, can promote investment in riskier activities that have potentially long-term payoffs. An emerging literature on economic policy uncertainty suggests a positive effect of predictability on investments, especially for large firms and sectors characterised by irreversible investments (Baker *et al.*, 2015; Bartelsman *et al.*, 2010).

Trade policy

The nature and structure of protection in overseas markets shape the opportunities for export diversification in developing countries. This is especially so if overseas protection is biased towards products in which a country enjoys a comparative advantage. For example, tariff escalation (the cascading of import tariffs according to the degree of processing) in developed countries has long constrained opportunities for developing countries to add value to and develop additional activities around agricultural and mineral products.[4] Similarly, for light manufacturing, import tariffs on products such as clothing and shoes are typically much higher than those on textile fabrics and leather. To some extent, this constraint has been alleviated by multilateral trade liberalisation through the WTO which has reduced tariff peaks in rich countries and through the provision of non-reciprocal tariff preferences for developing countries, although the latter are frequently undermined by unduly restrictive rules of origin. Nevertheless, an important challenge for developing countries, especially the poorest, is to better leverage trade preferences to drive export diversification.

Regional integration and deepened South-South trade also represent effective mechanisms to increase new market opportunities for exporting firms. Diversifying exports to higher income markets is often more difficult than diversifying exports to regional markets. Standards are often higher, requiring larger investments to raise quality and meet higher health and safety requirements (ITC, 2016). Developed country buyers may also demand very large consignments, requiring substantial investments in capacity. For this reason, diversification through exports to nearby countries with similar tastes and regulatory requirements – and hence potentially lower compliance costs - may prove easier. So will South-South trade. Expansion in such markets can then provide the springboard for enlarged access to the global market once experience with exporting has increased and awareness or product requirements in other markets has been accumulated.

Tariffs on imports can act as a constraint to export diversification and to sustained insertion in regional or global production networks. The level of import protection determines the incentives to produce exportable goods by directly raising the domestic price of imports relative to exports. It has long been known that there exists a symmetry (or equivalence) between the effects of an import tariff and an export tax on domestic relative prices. Import tariffs also indirectly alter the price of exports relative to the prices of (non-traded) goods produced solely for the domestic market. Since a tariff raises the price of imports, consumers will shift consumption toward non-traded goods and raise their price if these two types of goods are substitutes. Thus, a tariff on imports will reduce the price of exports relative to non-traded goods and shift production away from exports. Also, tariffs on intermediate inputs used by exporters in the absence of well-functioning duty drawback schemes increase the cost of producing goods for export and therefore, will reduce output of tradable goods. Tariffs on intermediates are of central importance to successful participation in regional and global value chains.

It is also important to address non-tariff measures (NTMs) as part of a diversification strategy. Rules and regulations in overseas markets governing issues such as border procedures, technical regulations and standards can raise trade costs and limit entry by new exporters, especially when they are designed and/or implemented in a way that discriminates against trade. Lack of information and uncertainty regarding export-related requirements for exporting can undermine the survival rates of exporting firms. Standards can facilitate exports, and product upgrading, by codifying the requirements that are necessary to export to markets where demands for health, safety and for quality differ from the domestic market. NTMs that limit imports to the domestic market can also undermine exports by limiting competition among suppliers of key inputs and therefore access to new technologies. The WTO provides needed disciplines on discriminatory regulatory measures and a forum for challenging regulations that arbitrarily discriminate against suppliers through the TBT Agreement and non-science-based food safety, animal and plant health measures through the SPS Agreement.

More recently, the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement provides a mechanism for the global adoption of best practices regarding customs procedures as well as a forum to challenge discriminatory practices. Preferential trade agreements that include provisions for harmonisation or mutual recognition of product standards can also help reduce the costs associated with regulatory diversity and support diversification.

Services trade policies can spur diversification through the expansion of services exports. They can also promote the diversification of goods exports through improved access to a wider range of more efficiently produced services inputs. High costs for energy, telecoms, logistics, and finance, erode firms' competitiveness and deter them from diversifying production and exports. As countries develop, service sector liberalisation can help firms to meet supply requirements, diversify, and integrate into global value chains in goods and services markets alike. Efficient services are also crucial for taking advantage of modern distribution channels. For example, producers are increasingly using e-commerce to sell directly to consumers through web-based outlets. However, diversification toward services exports can be hampered by regulatory diversity. Regulatory heterogeneity affects the fixed cost of entry into a new market as well as the variable costs of servicing that market (Kox and Nordas, 2007). To address this challenge, service sector reforms should go beyond trade openness by focusing on the simplification, harmonisation, approximation or mutual recognition of domestic regulations. (Gari, 2018; Polanco Lazo and Sauvé, 2017).

Rwanda's recent development trajectory illustrates the economy-wide benefits that can derive from a determined focus on diversification and value addition anchored in trade policy (see Box 5.2).

Box 5.2. Rwanda's export diversification path

Rwanda's policy framework has enabled it to successfully diversify exports while simultaneously raising the value of traditional commodity exports. Rwanda succeeded in growing its exports by about 20 percent annually from 2000 to 2016. Over the period, exports have become less dependent on the country's three traditional export products: tea, coffee and minerals. While their export share dropped from 41 percent to 25 percent, their overall export value more than tripled, from USD 415 million to USD 4,125 million. Trade policy focused on value addition has helped to mitigate the impacts of swings in international commodity prices. This is exemplified by the government's coffee strategy, whose focus on improving quality has increased farmgate prices for certain varieties by a factor of 5. Such efforts helped to offset drops in international prices between 2011 and 2015. By continuing to increase value-addition, Rwanda has laid the foundations for resurgent farming earnings once commodity prices rebound.

Rwanda has similarly transformed itself into a services economy, with aspirations to overcome the country's landlocked status by developing it into a regional hub for professional and business services. Half of Rwanda's export earnings already come from services, with mountain gorilla tourism leading the way, followed by transport, ICT, construction and finance. Meanwhile, the improving quality and range of domestic services inputs contributes importantly to the country's rising competitiveness in goods exports.

Rwanda's non-mineral industrial sector has also started exporting, particularly for agro-processing. While light manufacturing has remained broadly constant in export share, the value of exports has witnessed a fourfold increase since 2005, reflecting a rise in exports in a number of new industries, including apparel and leather products, mechanical appliances and beverages.

Regional markets have played an important role in sustaining Rwanda's diversification efforts. The country saw a considerable increase in intra-regional goods trade following its accession to the East African Community (EAC) in 2009, with improved connectivity to the ports of Mombasa (Kenya) and Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) playing a key role. While conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) limited trade prior to 2007, greater regional stability has seen a marked pick-up in commercial ties. By 2016, Rwanda exported more goods and services to the DRC than to the EAC.


Source: World Bank (2019). .

Competition policy

Competition policy plays an important role in the expansion of an efficient and diverse private sector and goes beyond implementing a legal framework for addressing dominant positions, collusion, unfair competition, and antitrust investigations to cover legal enforcement, competition advocacy and institutional effectiveness. Anti-competitive behaviour can seriously inhibit the scope and incentives to innovate and diversify (see Figure 5.4). Clear antitrust and competition laws and their effective and predictable enforcement are necessary to complement regulations that enable firm entry and rivalry. Left undetected, cartel agreements and abuse of dominant market positions can raise prices and discourage firms from investing in new or better products. Empirical evidence shows that on average, stronger market competition encourages innovation. In addition to increasing firms' incentives for "process innovation", promoting competition also encourages "product innovation".

Competition policy can also support "disruptive innovation", for example in service industries based on mobile technologies. Competition policy can enhance the impact of innovation programs on economic diversification. In Moldova, for example, the introduction of competition principles (transparent allocation criteria) into R&D incentive programs reduced the scope for selectivity bias toward connected firms, allowing less connected start-ups to access these programs. The application of rules that guarantee competitive neutrality in markets with state-owned enterprises can help firms to enter, expand and diversify based on their merits. By contrast, rules that discriminate against certain firms in favor of vested interests can hinder economic diversification. Lack of political will or institutional capacity constraints can limit the efficacy of competition policy reforms.

Figure 5.4. Competition policy and economic diversification



Source: World Bank and OECD (2017).

Competition policy can also play a key role in increasing the efficiency of domestic input supplying industries and support greater backward and forward linkages that foster diversification. Reforms that boost competition in input markets have spillovers on downstream firms. In many developing countries, input markets (such as fertiliser, cement, energy, finance and telecommunication markets), are often saddled with entry barriers and anticompetitive behaviour, due to economies of scale, network effects and the presence of state-owned enterprises.

Fostering greater competition among service suppliers can prove especially important to lowering prices for consumers and producers alike. While a host of other factors – small scale, weaker collateralisation of intangible assets, inadequate access to finance, regulatory deficiencies – contribute to service sector inefficiencies, studies show that the pay-off from increased competition and efficiency could be large. Scaling up services trade provides double benefits: services exports represent a potentially important source of foreign exchange earnings that underpin diversification efforts. Meanwhile, services imports can lead to greater competition, lower prices and increase quality, enhancing efficiency gains and competitiveness in the process (Roy, 2019). Hoekman and Shepherd (2015) argue that the greater contestability of services markets improves overall allocative efficiency by producing significant benefits for downstream users, particularly in manufacturing. Using cross-country data for the world and East Africa, they find that a 10 percent reduction in a country's services policy stance (as measured by the World Bank's Services Trade Restrictive Index (STRI) is associated with a 4.4 percent increase in manufactured exports from a country such as Rwanda.

Competition policy reforms can have tangible impacts on diversification, as the following examples show:

- In India, downstream manufacturing firms diversified production following far-reaching services reforms enacted in the 1990s that promoted competition in key input markets (in particular, the liberalisation of telecommunications, transport and energy markets).
- In Kenya, competition policy reform was central to the emergence of mobile banking services. The entrance of Mobile Virtual Network Operators into the banking industry led to the introduction of new banking products, promoted the entry of new small businesses and resulted in significant gains in financial inclusion.
- In Honduras, competition policy reform promoted the entry of new firms in agricultural input markets (fertilisers and pesticides). The reform eliminated discretionary procedures and reduced the registration time from three years to ninety days. Since the reforms were enacted, three hundred new products were registered, and the price of some pesticides fell by 9 percent.
- In the Philippines, competition policy reform in the transport sector prevented incumbent operators from discouraging new companies from serving certain routes. The reform is expected to generate significant savings in logistics costs. In addition, new entry into the shipping industry may improve the quality of shipping services and promote diversification toward new industries, such as refrigerated shipping services.

THE IMPERATIVE OF REDUCED TRADE COSTS

The single most important determinant of long-run trade growth is reducing the cost of getting goods to market – and securing inputs for local producers at lowest cost. For landlocked and small island economies, transportation costs inflate the costs of exporting and of sourcing inputs by up to 50 percent. While distance remains the most important source of trade costs, the lack of facilitation at borders, the fragmentation of supply chains and limited access to affordable air cargo opportunities or land transport corridors all contribute to the high cost of trading across borders (Rastogi *et al.*, 2014). Investing in trade-related infrastructure, coordinated with relevant policy reforms and better governance, is key to help reduce trade costs and support more diversified trade. Estimates from nine Latin American countries suggest that a 10 per cent decline in average transport costs would be associated with an expansion of more than 10 per cent in the number of products exported (Moreira *et al.*, 2008). In LDCs, the focus should be on ensuring that basic port, border and connecting transport infrastructure is in place. Best practices from trade and development projects implemented by the World Bank and other development partners show the importance of coordinating such infrastructure interventions with aid-for-trade support targeted at: (i) measures to simplify border procedures and improve the standards of treatment of traders and officials, including through training and other capacity building support; and, (ii) programs that address institutional weaknesses and governance failures among those ministries involved in trade issues and border clearance agencies, for example, by introducing performance based management of agencies operating at the border.

Trade logistics services are a critical determinant of countries' connectivity to regional and global markets and their competitiveness. The importance of trade logistics has increased with the splitting up of production on a global scale and the increasing sensitivity of trade to transport and logistics costs. The decisions of firms on the country in which to locate, from which suppliers to buy, and which consumer markets to enter are all influenced by the quality of logistics. Thus, the cost, range and quality of logistics services available to exporters can define the scope for export diversification. For example, slow and costly logistics can prevent entry of otherwise competitive suppliers into just-in-time supply chains. Good trade logistics are crucial for the competitiveness of activities which rely upon imported inputs.

Logistics performance remains an area where performance improvement can support the diversification priorities of developing countries. Available empirical evidence suggests that export concentration is often associated with poor logistics (World Bank, 2017). A range of studies have indeed shown the importance of logistics for competitiveness and the development of the light manufacturing sectors that can drive diversification such as apparel, leather products and agribusiness (Huria and Brenton, 2016).

The trade logistics sector is often characterised by regulatory and institutional fragmentation and a lack of coordination that can be just as costly to supply chains as direct transport costs. The sector provides a large set of activities which includes all modes of transportation services and a range of related ancillary services including freight forwarding, distribution, packaging, warehousing services, transport management services, and supply chain consulting services. Logistics services providers also require access to critical transport infrastructure (ports, airports, roads) in a non-discriminatory manner and are dependent on the time and cost of satisfying border procedures. This implies that logistics services are subject to many rules and regulations under the responsibility of different regulatory authorities, each with different regulatory objectives, and often with little coordination. Such fragmentation compromises the underlying network, increasing costs and reducing efficiency. It also aggravates the competitive disadvantage faced by some countries by virtue of their geographical position.

Regulations that support greater competition in the logistics sector and simplification of the requirements to meet legitimate policy objectives can reduce the cost of trade logistics, raise quality and variety and so support a more diverse production and export base. While high barriers remain in a number of countries, there has been a degree of liberalisation of transportation services in developing countries that has reduced barriers that restrict foreign participation or discriminate against foreign providers. Other components of the logistics services chain, such as cargo handling, freight forwarding, still confront high barriers to entry. In addition, the regulatory framework governing the operation of logistics services is often complex. While regulations are often necessary to achieve objectives such as safety, they may be designed with the aim of protecting the interests of domestic industries. Full implementation of the WTO's Trade Facilitation Agreement and deepened liberalisation commitments in the cluster of transport and logistics-related services noted above assume particular importance as policy complements in this regard.

INTERVENTIONS THAT TARGET SPECIFIC MARKET, POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL FAILURES

Effective government interventions to support economic diversification require a fluid dialogue and close coordination with the private sector – both domestic and foreign. Appropriate institutional arrangements are needed to elicit information from the private sector about potential opportunities for economic diversification; about existing bottlenecks that prevent a country from taking advantage of such opportunities; and about concrete actions and policies best able to remove such obstacles. Moreover, institutions must be able to cope with the challenge of sustaining interventions over time and coping with the risk of capture and rent-seeking often inherent in public-private interaction. As institutional capabilities vary greatly across countries, policymakers must be mindful of policies that match their existing capabilities. Types of government interventions that can support diversification include the following elements:

Export Promotion Agencies

Export promotion agencies and initiatives can address information failures that affect firm entry and survival in foreign markets. Low entry and/or low survival rates of exporting firms may result from information asymmetries such as difficulty in gaining information on product standards in destination markets. These can be mitigated when there is a greater presence of exporters of the same country operating in the same export markets or with more experience in exporting the same products. When such information is not readily available, export promotion agencies can usefully fill the gap. These institutions can notably address information gaps for firms operating in non-traditional sectors, even if they are not yet exporters.

However, export promotion agencies have a mixed record in promoting diversification. While some agencies have made strong contributions to the export performance of their sponsoring countries, such models are not always easily replicable. Evidence points to several features that contribute to successful export promotion. First, it works in policy environments that do not exhibit a strong bias against exports (such as an overvalued exchange rate or high tariffs that provide nominal and effective protection, or high trade costs). Special procedures, such as export processing zones or special export finance facilities, can shield exporters from poor trade policy environments but they may need to incorporate sunset clauses and reward rather than pick winners (Lederman *et al.*, 2010). Second, export promotion agencies work best when they function autonomously, flexibly, and maintain open communication channels with private actors to support a demand-driven strategy. Third, export promotion activities are best financed through general revenues rather than through taxes on exports.

Investment promotion agencies

Investment policy and promotion efforts can support diversification by attracting greater volumes of foreign direct investment (FDI). Good practice is to refrain from using *mandatory* local content requirements (Sauvé, 2016); to promote policy coherence between FDI linkages to local firms and investment incentives, notably through well designed supplier development programs (see Box 5.3); and to provide a host of investor "after-care" services, including those targeted at anticipating possible sources of tension between host countries and foreign firms (World Bank Group 2018). Fewer procedural steps required to establish wholly foreign-owned, domestically-incorporated, companies, and fewer restrictions to the FDI arbitration process are associated with higher FDI stocks (Qiang *et al.*, 2015). International investment disciplines, particularly those embedded in PTAs, have been shown to increase FDI in participating countries. But restrictions on foreign acquisitions, discrimination in licensing, restrictions on the repatriation of earnings, and inadequate legal frameworks to appeal regulatory decisions can easily deter foreign investment.

Box 5.3. Stimulating product upgrading through supplier development programs

An increasingly effective means to increase exports is to deepen the domestic supply chain of value added. To the extent that domestic suppliers can substitute for imports now going into exports, increasing value added contributes to embodied exports. Doing so typically requires quality upgrading to improve linkages between domestic suppliers and large international 'anchor' firms. This is particularly important because anchor firms often have detailed technical and quality requirements for their supplies which may differ from generic quality certification. Globally recognisable producers with brand names to uphold often require suppliers to comply with additional private standards linked to social, environmental, labour, gender or safety norms which may exceed national legal requirements (UNIDO, 2013; Steenbergen and Sutton, 2017).

A supplier development program can help develop domestic supply chains and promote important host country FDI spillovers. This is done by bringing large anchor firms and potential local suppliers together, a task which investment promotion agencies are well placed to perform, and then providing additional support and incentives to ensure that suppliers get the appropriate training and upgrading assistance to ensure that their products meet the quality standards of the anchor firm. Chile's Supplier development program offers a model of ways to foster domestic supply chains in a market supportive way. The program eschews mandated (and WTO non-compliant) rules for value-addition but focuses instead on improving commercial linkages between SMEs and large foreign customers through various 'marriage counselling/matchmaking' services, subsidised credit and other fiscal incentives to promote linkages. Arraiz *et al.* (2013) found that this program was significantly effective in increasing sales, employment and the survival rates of SME suppliers. Similar programs have been launched in El Salvador, Colombia and Malaysia.

The role of FDI as an enabler of diversification depends on *the type of investment.* Not all foreign investment is the same as far as positive spillovers to the rest of the economy are concerned. Mining shows fewer linkages than agribusiness. Joint-ventures between foreigners and local entrepreneurs unleash greater spillovers than projects financed and run only by foreigners. So do projects that involve investors from neighbouring countries, who generally know the receiving country better. The literature distinguishes four types of FDI: (i) *natural resource-seeking* investment (focused on exploiting natural resources); *market-seeking* investment (serving large domestic or regional markets); *strategic asset-seeking* investment (driven by investor interest in acquiring strategic assets through mergers and acquisitions); and *efficiency-seeking* investment (focusing on export-oriented production).

As noted above, efficiency-seeking FDI is particularly conducive to diversification. This type of investment is typically export-oriented and leverages local factors of production to reduce production costs. It involves the transfer of production and managerial know-how, enhances access to distribution networks and sources of finance. Low and middle-income countries that succeed in attracting "efficiency-seeking" FDI have greater success in diversifying their export structure.

For example, in Honduras, FDI played a role in jumpstarting the country's light manufacturing sector and in the diversification of exports over the last decade. Thanks to FDI and its linkages with domestic firms, Mexico developed its aerospace industry in less than two decades, taking advantage of closer regional ties (within the NAFTA) to insert local producers into the continental production networks operating in the sector.

The impact of FDI on diversification also depends importantly on *host* country conduct. Countries with less education or larger technological gaps generally find it more difficult to extract spillovers from inward foreign investment. The impact that foreign investment exerts on the overall economy ultimately depends on the quality of the business environment. All things equal, countries with better business regulatory environments tend to be more attractive to FDI. This explains why foreign investments in Chile's mining, Vietnam's agriculture, and Mauritius's IT sectors have helped raise diversification of production and improve the productivity of workers and firms, including those that operate outside the FDI attracting sectors.

Spatial Policies

Spatial Policies (SPs) can play an important role when growth is not regionally balanced and certain areas within countries lag behind (Moreira *et al.*, 2013). SPs involve policy interventions which aim to stimulate the economic development of specific locations within a country by attracting the emergence of productive and innovate firms. The key characteristics of SPs are that they: (i) target a specific area; (ii) are tailored to the specific context and history of a locality; (iii) aim to overcome coordination failures between different actors; and (iv) frequently involve stakeholders at the national and local levels in the assessment, design and implementation stages. These activities can be organised around four types of interventions: (i) growth poles; (ii) special economic zones; (iii) economic corridors; and (iv) clusters.

Growth Poles emanate from a core location, where one or more critical industries or a group of firms are located. This core is frequently identified with a city or area where substantial agglomeration economies occur, allowing dynamic industries to exchange and diffuse new knowledge, innovation, share pools of skilled labour and infrastructure, all the while minimising the costs of providing public goods and services. In growth poles, strategic public investments in infrastructure can help to unleash the economic potential of selected locations and generate a catalytic effect on upstream and downstream industries. Additional economic activity, innovation and economic growth are subsequently expected to propel the economic dynamism of neighbouring areas through the diffusion of these activities.

Special Economic Zones (SEZs) have been used to support diversification. SEZs are typically established to achieve one or more of the following aims: (i) attracting FDI; (ii) serving as "pressure valves" to alleviate large-scale unemployment; (iii) supporting a wider economic reform strategy; and, (iv) acting as experimental areas for the application of new policies and approaches (Farole, 2011). SEZs, such as export processing zones or industrial parks, typically offer a mix of financial incentives (e.g. tax breaks, subsidies), infrastructure facilities (e.g. uninterrupted electricity supply), trade facilitation (expedited customs procedures, duty free access to imported inputs), access to land, and protection from government interference, to induce a critical mass of private firms to enter, invest, and diversify economic activity. However, the empirical evidence on their effectiveness is mixed. SEZs have been successful when they attract investment that exploits a key source of comparative advantage—typically low-cost labour in developing countries. For example, in addition to successful examples from China and Malaysia, countries such as the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Madagascar, Mauritius, Taiwan and Vietnam have all seen a significant number of manufacturing jobs created through export processing zones. However, there is also a substantial literature of examples of failed special economic zones that did not generate new economic activity (Lederman and Maloney, 2012).The success of SEZs requires a flexible approach that is not based solely on fiscal incentives, limited labor regulations and wage restraint but encompasses a broader approach to providing an effective business environment and building firm-level competitiveness, linkages with the domestic economy, innovation and social and environmental sustainability.

Economic Corridors are characterised by the connection of two economic centers through connective infrastructure. The aim of developing a corridor is to leverage and intensify the growth potential of the two nodes at each end of the corridor by promoting the agglomeration of economic activity between the two nodes, along the physical infrastructure connecting them. Economic corridors may encompass several smaller nodes along the way and could, in certain cases, evolve into a branch shaped structure. Economic corridors can be subnational in nature (connecting to sub-regional hubs, such as the Sulawesi Economic Corridor in Indonesia), national or even international (such as the East-West Corridor connecting Myanmar, Thailand, Laos and Vietnam). Most corridors are multi-sectoral, although sector specific corridors, such as agriculture focused corridors, also exist. Specific policy interventions within an economic corridor approach typically encompass public and private investments. Crucial to the development of the corridor is the transport infrastructure investments – often multimodal – connecting the two economic nodes. Private sector investment projects, combined with trade and regulatory policy reforms to improve the overall business environment of the corridor either take place simultaneously to the development of the basic infrastructure or ensue shortly after. Furthermore, the development of sectoral development plans can help boost the competitiveness of specific industries located within the corridor.

Clusters are geographic concentrations of interconnected companies and institutions in a particular sector. Prominent examples are the financial industry in London, the IT cluster in Bangalore and the leather sector in Italy. A typical cluster is comprised of firms in the same or closely related sectors, networks of specialised suppliers and service providers as well as by the existence of infrastructure tailored to the specific needs of the firms and industries in the clusters. One of the essential characteristics of a cluster is the presence of strong collaborative links between all the stakeholders in the cluster, including firms, industry associations, government agencies, and universities and research centers. In clusters, private companies tend to collaborate with one another. Collaboration mechanisms can include investing in research institutes that conduct research on topics and generate knowledge that contribute to the advancement of the sector or related sectors at the heart of the cluster. Pooling resources to enhance the quality of the cluster products and improve their commercialisation and marketing offers another example. Local research centers, universities or consultancies also often provide industry-specific training programs and basic and applied research relevant to the cluster. Government agencies can provide support to the provision of infrastructure and a sound regulatory environment.

Firms in well-functioning clusters benefit from the agglomeration economies, described above, through pooled labor markets, forward and backward linkages and knowledge spill-overs. Some clusters can appear spontaneously, as a consequence of the functioning of market forces. In other cases, however, clusters require careful planning and support in order to emerge and take off, especially in areas which lack sufficient economic density or where the coordination among different stakeholders is difficult, because of limited density, too great a distance to the technological frontier or institutional deficiencies. In these cases, cluster policies are needed in order to prompt the creation and consolidation of new and emerging clusters, as well as the further specialisation of existing ones. Facilitating networking platforms in order to improve coordination and generate knowledge spillovers, investments in specific infrastructure and programs for academia-private-sector collaboration are examples of specific policy interventions that may help to trigger cluster formation or propel the economic dynamism of existing clusters.

POLICIES TO SUPPORT ADJUSTMENT

The labour market is often key to the adjustment process. The extent and speed with which labour moves between occupations, firms, industries and locations, as well as the size of the adjustment costs borne by adversely affected workers, is to a large extent determined by the functioning of the labour market. In general, investing in education and skills contributes positively to economic diversification – telling examples include the growth of India's software industry, the increased sophistication of China's exports as well as rising exports of business services from the Philippines (Agosin *et al.*, 2012). However, high enrolment rates in secondary and tertiary education do not automatically translate into high-quality learning. Skills development depends on the quality of educational inputs and a focus on learning outcomes. Secondary schools and universities may produce graduates with narrow skills or with specialisations in fields that are no longer in high demand. Alignment with labour market demand is critical to address skill mismatches and support economic diversification. Addressing such mismatches is proving particularly important as a determinant of digital uptake.

Improving public-private coordination is required to better identify the skills needed for current and future labour needs. Despite improvements in the overall level of education among workers over the past five decades, firms continue to struggle to find workers with the required skill-sets. Many countries have education and training systems that are not developing the kinds of skills needed by the private sector. These are the skills that allow firms to deliver the products and services demanded by the increasingly globalised markets in which they operate. Therefore, longer-term education and labour reform needs to be accompanied by improved systems for skills development, particularly vocational training. These systems need to be informed by the private sector so that they can deliver the range of skills that are relevant to evolving market demands and to the firms that have the potential to deliver growth and productivity gains in the near and medium term.

Gender inequalities act to undermine efforts to diversify. High levels of gender inequality are associated with lower levels of export and output diversification and the available evidence suggests that gender inequalities are a cause of low diversification (Kazandjian *et al.*, 2016). Inequalities of opportunity, for example in education, constrain the pool of human capital upon which diversification can be driven. Discrimination that limits the volume and nature of labour force participation by women narrows the pool of talent from which employers can hire. It also limits the number of female entrepreneurs. Hence, identifying and addressing gender disparities and constraints in education, training, access to finance and information networks and in the labour market represent important elements of inclusive diversification strategies.

A well-functioning financial sector is a further key element to support diversification. Financial instruments, intermediaries, and markets can facilitate the trading, hedging, and pooling of risks that firms take when they opt to diversify. Deeper financial markets and the diversity of funding sources they offer support diversification into more complex goods and greater varieties. They do so by allowing firms to access long-term capital financing and by funding riskier investments. In Africa, for example, shallow financial sectors have been a major obstacle in efforts to diversify economies, as firms become unduly reliant on a narrow range of risk-averse lenders, typically banks. Obstacles in the financial sphere include complex credit application procedures, lack of collateral, high lending costs, inadequate venture capital and non-bank sources of funding, and short maturities against the backdrop of low financial capability which prevent firms from accessing finance.

Policies that support innovation and entrepreneurship and the reallocation of resources to innovating firms can be important in supporting the move to a wider range of higher quality of goods and services. Investing in innovation increases firm capabilities, facilitating the adoption of new technologies that improve productivity and product quality. Both product and process innovation can help firms to diversify by reducing production costs and freeing up resources that could be redeployed into innovative activities.

FINAL THOUGHTS

This chapter's discussion of the diversification challenges and paths taken by a range of developing countries suggests that no single formula exists that can promote an orderly process of structural change able to enhance the resilience of economies to external shocks and provide citizens with the more productive employment opportunities they crave. Policy must always and everywhere adapt to the specific circumstances, differing geographies and endowments, and contrasted institutional, governance and implementation capacities of countries at differing levels of development. The success of diversification efforts ultimately depends on the mix, sequencing, and timing of investments, policy reforms and institution building, and on their consistency with the underlying assets and related comparative advantages of any given country. Investments in skills, infrastructure, institutions and governance quality (i.e. enhancing the transparency, accountability, and predictability of government decision-making) increase the likelihood of success of diversification but are in turn affected by the extent of diversification.

While every country follows a different path to diversification, a number of common features are apparent from successful cases of sustained trade-led structural change. The experience of several countries suggests the following are important drivers of successful diversification efforts:

(i) a broad level of political commitment within government and societal support towards the goals of economic development, poverty reduction and social stability;

(ii) a focus on export growth, FDI attraction and on increasing the range of goods and services exported;

(iii) the importance of a strong, technically capable administration to manage the diversification process;

(iv) the presence of influential stakeholders with interests in non-mineral exportable sectors, to offset in part the political influence of the dominant sector(s);

(v) the importance of building both human capital and institutional capacity (Gelb, 2010).

In many instances, sustaining a diversification drive will require a multi-pronged approach targeted at stimulating exports of agricultural and manufacturing products and services. In most country settings, no single sector can (nor should) provide the necessary export growth on its own. Similarly, there are important and growing interdependencies between sectors, notably between services and manufacturing, that prevent any sector from growing too large without sufficiently competitive inputs from other sectors.

While the current global environment creates daunting challenges for poor, small, landlocked and/or resource-dependent countries, this chapter has shown that a range of diversification routes can be followed. For such routes to prove successful, however, policy attention needs to be paid to four key determinants of diversification strategies which development partners and International Organisations can support through targeted aid-for-trade interventions. These are:

(i) the supply of appropriate incentive frameworks;

(ii) investments and policy reforms targeted at reducing trade costs;

(iii) effective policies to support adjustment and the reallocation of resources towards new activities; and

(iv) government interventions directed at specific market, policy and institutional failures

NOTES

1. This chapter was drafted by Paul Brenton, Ian Gillson and Pierre Sauvé from the World Bank Group's Macroeconomics, Trade and Investment Global Practice. The authors are grateful to Michael Roberts and to Sarah Mohan for helpful comments and suggestions. Corresponding author: psauve@worldbank.org.
2. The Herfindahl index (also known as Herfindahl–Hirschman Index or HHI) is a measure of the size of firms in relation to the industry and an indicator of the amount of competition among them. Named after economists Orris C. Herfindahl and Albert O. Hirschman, it is an economic concept widely applied in competition law analysis. The HHI is defined as the sum of the squares of the market shares of the firms within the industry where the market shares are expressed as fractions. The result is proportional to the average market share, weighted by market share. As such, it can range from 0 to 1.0, moving from a huge number of very small firms to a single monopolistic producer. Increases in the Herfindahl index generally indicate a decrease in competition and an increase of market power, whereas decreases indicate the opposite.
3. In low-income countries, 63 per cent of workers were still employed in the agricultural sector in 2018, down by just 8 percentage points since 1991 (see Figure 1).
4. The growing vibrancy of South-South trade has drawn increasing attention to the fact that the tariff structure of large emerging countries also features punitive elements of tariff escalation.
5. One probing example is the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania ("SAGCOT"), a public-private partnership initiated at the World Economic Forum (WEF) Africa (WEFA) Summit in Dar es Salaam in 2010 and whose implementation period runs for 20 years up to 2030. Its ultimate objective is to boost agricultural productivity, improve food security, reduce poverty and ensure environmental sustainability through the commercialisation of smallholder agriculture. See http://sagcot.co.tz/

REFERENCES

Aghion, P., Blundell, R., Griffith, R., Howitt, P. and Prantl, S. (2006), "The effects of entry on incumbent innovation and productivity". *NBER Working Paper* No. 12027, Cambridge, Mass.: National Bureau of Economic Research

Agosin, M., R. Alvarez et C. Bravo-Ortega (2012), "Determinants of Export Diversification around the World: 1962-2000", in *The World Economy*, 35(3): 295-315.

Andrews, Dan, and Federico Cingano (2014), "Public policy and resource allocation: evidence from firms in OECD countries", in *Economic Policy*, 29: 253-296.

Araiz, I., F. Henriquez and P. Stucchi (2013), "Supplier Development Programs and Firm Performance: Evidence from Chile", in *Small Business Economics*, 41: 277-93.

Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2015), "Measuring economic policy uncertainty", *NBER Working Paper* No. 21633, Cambridge, Mass: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Baldwin, Richard (2016), *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Bartelsman, E., Haltiwanger, J., & Scarpetta, S. (2010), "Cross-country and within-country differences in the business climate", in *International Journal of Industrial Organizatio*n, 28(4), 368-371.

Farole, T. and D. and Winkler (2012), "Foreign Firm Characteristics, Absorptive Capacity and the Institutional Framework: The Role of Mediating Factors for FDI Spillovers in Low- and Middle-Income Countries", *Policy Research Working Paper* 6265, Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Farole T. (2011), *Special Economic Zones in Africa: Comparing Performance and Learning from Global Experience*, Directions in Development: Trade, Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Gari, Gabriel (2018), "Recent Preferential Trade Agreements' Disciplines for Tackling Regulatory Divergence in Services: How Far beyond GATS?", in *World Trade Review*, (November), 1-29 doi: 10.1017/S1474756180003 68

Gelb, A. (2010), "*Economic Diversification in Resources Rich Countries*", Washington, D.C.: Centre for Global Development.

Hallward-Driemeier, M. and G. Nayyar (2017), *Trouble in the Making? The Future of Manufacturing-Led Development*, Washington. D.C.: World Bank, available at file:///C:/Users/wb16765/Downloads/9781464811746%20(3).pdf

Herrendorf, B. , R. Rogerson and Á. Valentinyi (2014), "Growth and Structural Transformation", Chapter 6 in Aghion, P. and S.N. Durlauf *Handbook of Economic Growth*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 855-941.

Hoekman, B. and B. Shepherd (2015), "Services Productivity, Trade Policy, and Manufacturing Exports," *RSCAS Working Papers* 2015/07, European University Institute.

Hsieh, C.T., Klenow, P.J. (2009), "Misallocation and manufacturing productivity in China and India", in *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124 (4), 1403–1448.

Huria, A and P. Brenton (2016), *Export Diversification in Africa: The Importance of Good Trade Logistics*, Washington, DC: World Bank, available at https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/22346

ILO (2019), *World Employment Social Outlook: Trends 2019*, Geneva: ILO.

IMF (2014), "Long-Run Growth and Macroeconomic Stability in Low-Income Countries—The Role of Structural Transformation and Diversification", *IMF Policy Paper*, (March), Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

International Trade Centre (2018), *SME Competitiveness Outlook 2018: Business Ecosystems for the Digital Age*, Geneva: International Trade Centre, available at http://www.intracen.org/publication/smeco2018/

International Trade Centre (2016), *SME Competitiveness Outlook 2016: Meeting the Standard for Trade, Geneva*: International Trade Centre, available at http://www.intracen.org/publication/SME-Competitiveness-Outlook-Meeting-the-Standard-for-Trade/

Kazandjian, Romina and Kolovich, Lisa and Newiak, Monique and Kochhar, Kalpana (2016), "Gender Equality and Economic Diversification", *IMF Working Paper* No. 16/140, Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund, available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2882575

Kox, H., and H. K. Nordås, (2007), "Services Trade and Domestic Regulation", *Trade Policy Working Paper* 49, Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Lan, J. and B. Shepherd (2018), *Women and the Services Sector: Gender, Structural Transformation and Deindustrialization*, Mimeo, Geneva: World Trade Organization.

Lederman, D. and W. Maloney (2012), "*Does what you export matter? In Search of Empirical Guidance for Industrial Policies*", Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Lederman, D. Olarreaga, M., and Payton L. (2010), "Export Promotion Agencies: do they work?", in *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 91, No. 2, pp. 257-265.

Meller, P. and A. Simpasa (with the collaboration of Bernardo Lara & Gonzalo Valdés) (2011), "The role of copper in the Chilean & Zambian economies: main economic and policy issues", *GDN Working Paper Series*, No. 43, New Delhi: Global Development Network.

Moreira, M. M. *et al.*, eds. (2013), *Too far to export: domestic transport cost and regional export disparities in Latin America and the Caribbean*, Washington, D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank.

Moreira, M. M., C. Volpe and J. S. Blyde (2008), *Unclogging the Arteries: The Impact of Transport Costs on Latin American and Caribbean Trade*, Washington DC: Inter-American Development Bank.

National Board of Trade (2010), *Servification of Swedish manufacturing*, Stockholm: Kommerskollegium, available at https://www.kommers.se/Documents/dokumentarkiv/publikationer/2010/skriftserien/report-2010-1-servicification-of-swedish-manufacturing.pdf

Polanco Lazo, Rodrigo and Pierre Sauvé (2017), "The Treatment of Regulatory Convergence in Preferential Trade Agreements", in *World Trade Review*, (December), 1-33, Available at: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/world-trade-review/article/treatment-of-regulatory-convergence-in-preferential-trade-agreements/35BC4EC5C6FA309ADF27291085CC684D

Roy, Martin (2019), "Elevating Services: Services Trade Policy, WTO Commitments, and their Role in Economic Development and Trade Integration", *G-24 Working Paper*, Washington, D.C.: Intergovernmental Group of Twenty-Four, (January), available at https://www.g24.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Roy_G24_paper__Jan_2019.pdf

Sauvé, Pierre (2019), "*Gendered Perspectives on Services Trade and Investment*", Mimeo, Paper prepared as background for a joint World Bank Group-World Trade Organization report on Trade and Gender, Geneva: World Bank Group.

Sauvé, Pierre (2016), "Life beyond local content: exploring alternative measures of industry support in the context of WTO accession", in *Journal of International Trade*, Volume 1, Number 1, pp. 1-28. Available at http://wtocentre.iift.ac.in/journal/pdf/Article1_Pierre_Sauve.pdf

Steenbergen, V. and J. Sutton (2017), "*Establishing a Local Content Unit for Rwanda*", Oxford and London: International Growth Centre.

UNIDO (2013), *The UNIDO Approach to Sustainable Supplier Development: Promoting CSRs for SMEs in a Global Supply Chain Context*, Technical Paper, Vienna: United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

World Bank (2019), *Future Drivers of Growth in Rwanda: Innovation, Integration, Agglomeration, and Competition*." Conference Edition, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank Group, available at https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/30732

World Bank (2018), *Global Investment Competitiveness Report 2017-18: Foreign Investor Perspectives and Policy Implications*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group, available at https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/28493

World Bank (2017), *Economic Diversification: Guidance Note, Mimeo, Trade and Competitiveness Global Practice*, World Bank Group.

World Bank and Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (2017), *A Step Ahead: Competition Policy for Shared Prosperity and Inclusive Growth*. Washington, DC: World Bank, available at https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/27527

CHAPTER 6

THE CRITICAL ROLE OF TRADE FACILITATION IN SUPPORTING ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND STRUCTURAL REFORMS

Contributed by the World Bank, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Abstract: *Two years after the entry into force of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement, it is time for an initial stock-taking. The experience of the World Bank Group Trade Facilitation Support Program (TFSP) and the UNCTAD Trade Facilitation Program, both major providers of trade-related assistance, as well as OECD's analytical work provides relevant insights.*

In these early years, support has been generally directed to the "foundational" measures of the Agreement, such as National Trade Facilitation Committees. These will oversee implementation; time release studies, providing a baseline to measure progress; and risk management policies and procedures, a precondition for implementation of simplified control and release processes. Progress is being made. TFSP and OECD research find that the level of alignment with the Agreement is increasing, with notable improvements in publication of measures, automation and streamlining of procedures and engagement with the trade community.

Positive impacts from these aid-for-trade supported reforms have also been registered. Country reports and periodic time release studies show reduction in customs physical inspections, elimination of unnecessary documents, automation of manual processing steps, and consequent reduction of clearance times. World Bank surveys (the Logistics Performance Index (LPI) and Doing Business) likewise show a positive trend in these aid-supported countries.

INTRODUCTION

Two years after entry into force of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA), an initial stock-taking of the progress made by the developing and least-developed (LDC) countries in implementation of the agreement, and the impact of aid in support thereof, is in order. The TFA has been ratified by 141 WTO members, or 86% of the total WTO membership.[1] Eighty-six developing and LDC members have notified their intent to take advantage of the special and differential treatment provisions of the agreement and identified the measures of the agreement for which they require external technical assistance and capacity building (TACB) implementation support. Trade facilitation has been identified as a top Aid-for-Trade priority by 62 developing countries in their responses to the 2019 joint OECD-WTO Monitoring and evaluation exercise (M&E).On the WTO donor member side, notifications to the WTO indicate that more than USD 1.6 billion has been disbursed worldwide on trade facilitation-related projects since 2014.[2]


In this chapter, we examine how aid for trade is supporting the implementation of the TFA and other trade facilitation reforms. Part II reviews what TACB assistance has been provided so far and why; what progress has been made by the recipient countries toward implementation of the TFA; and what impacts can be detected at this formative stage as a result of these aid-supported trade facilitation reforms. These questions will be examined in relation to the World Bank Group's Trade Facilitation Support Program, which is one of the implementing agencies and primary vehicles through which donor support to WTO developing and LDC members is provided. In Part III of this chapter, we take a prospective look at trade facilitation. In particular, we review how customs and other border clearance functions are adapting to the challenge of e-commerce and how aid for trade can - and does - support this process.

TECHNICAL AND CAPACITY BUILDING SUPPORT AND ITS IMPACTS

The World Bank Group Trade Facilitation Support Program

The Trade Facilitation Support Program (WB-TFSP), managed by the World Bank Group's Macroeconomics, Trade & Investment (MTI) Global Practice, provides support to countries seeking assistance in aligning their trade practices with the TFA. It prioritises assistance to countries with limited access to other donor support; particularly International Development Association (IDA)-eligible, low-income, and fragile and conflict affected countries; and middle-income countries that act as gateways to least developed countries and/or whose performance significantly impacts the performance of regional LDCs. The program is financed by nine development partners, who have committed more than USD 45 million since the program launch in 2014.[3] Since its inception, the WB-TFSP has provided support to 47 countries, approximately 40% of which are LDCs. About one-fourth of the countries in the program are located in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Figure 6.1. Regional Distribution of WB-TFSP Activities (by number of countries)



Source: TFSP Data

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953451

Table 6.1. WB-TFSP collaboration with other organisations

Partner	Areas of Collaboration (Illustrative)
Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC)	■ TFA gap assessments
International Air Transport Association (IATA)	■ Air cargo, expedited shipment measures
International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)	■ "E-phyto" pilot implementation ■ Sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) diagnostics
International Trade Centre (ITC)	■ Trade facilitation project plans ■ National Single Window planning
TradeMark East Africa	■ T FA gap assessment
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)	■ TFA gap assessments ■ National Trade Facilitation Committees ■ Risk management (ASYCUDA)
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)	■ Capacity building
U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)	■ TFA gap assessments ■ Time release studies ■ National Trade Facilitation Committees
World Customs Organization (WCO)	■ TFA gap assessments ■ Time release studies ■ Risk management ■ Authorised operator programs
World Trade Organization	■ TFA information provision ■ TACB coordination ■ Knowledge management and capacity building

The program also supports regional organisations, such as the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and the Central America Customs Union, to "address regional and sub-regional challenges" in their members implementation of trade facilitation measures and to "promote regional and sub-regional integration" as prescribed in the TFA.[4] WB-TFSP technical assistance is commonly deployed in collaboration with other Annex D[5] or technical or donor organisations, as well as in support of World Bank Group trade facilitation-related lending projects. This collaboration may take the form of a joint delivery of technical support, or it may be separately implemented but designed to complement the activities of these other organisations.

The focus of discussion in this chapter is the WB-TFSP's activities. Developing and LDC WTO members likewise receive TACB support for trade facilitation through programs of other Annex D and other organisations, such as the UNCTAD Trade Facilitation program. Accordingly, when evaluating the relationship between aid for trade and implementation progress and the impact of reforms, as we do below, it will be important to take into account the total TACB contribution made by all such development partners and organisations.

WTO Country Demand for TFA Implementation Support

Notifications submitted by WTO developing and LDC members to the WTO Trade Facilitation Committee highlight those TFA measures where technical assistance and capacity building support is in greatest demand and the types and direction of support required. Under the TFA's special and differential treatment provisions, a WTO developing or LDC member may, by notification to the WTO Trade Facilitation Committee within prescribed periods, designate

- those provisions of the TFA which it intends to implement upon entry into force ("Category A"),
- those provisions which it intends to implement following a delay period of its choosing ("Category B"), and
- those provisions the implementation of which will require provision of technical assistance and capacity building support and a delay period ("Category C").

Arriving at the scheduling of commitments has been a collaborative process with Annex D and other organisations offering TACB support. UNCTAD's trade facilitation program is profiled in Box 6. 1.

Box 6.1. UNCTAD Trade Facilitation Program

With over 40 years of experience in trade facilitation, UNCTAD has assisted over 55 countries in the drafting of national trade facilitation plans, forming and training National Trade Facilitation Committees (NTFC), and creating roadmaps to guide the implementation of the WTO TFA. Most of this has been recently done through the UNCTAD Empowerment Program for NTFCs, which provides knowledge transfer training ensuring impact sustainability. The modules composing this program are tailored to country-specific needs, which are developed by international experts. As of 2018, the Empowerment Program has been conducted in 21 countries and will start in 6 other countries in 2019. (unctad.org/eptf).

To support developing countries and LDC's work on trade facilitation, UNCTAD has continuously collected and updated information on more than 130 NTFCs all over the world. This has been made available in UNCTAD's online repository (unctad.org/tfc). UNCTAD has also published 23 technical notes, which explains trade facilitation measures' scope and rationale, benefits and opportunities, the role of different agencies and NTFCs, guidelines and next steps for implementing the WTO TFA.


In pursuit of customs automation, UNCTAD's ASYCUDA programme has built capacity in Customs Administrations of around 115 countries, 80% of which are already using ASYCUDA. With 51 operational projects, including seven regional and interregional projects, ASYCUDA represents the single largest technical cooperation programme in UNCTAD (asycuda.org).

UNCTAD's work on online Information Portals on foreign trade procedures, which promotes transparency in government to facilitate business, trade, and investment, has resulted in the implementation of 68 systems in 37 countries with around 3000 procedures documented online. This brought about an 80% reduction in business registration steps, forms, and documents (businessfacilitation.org).

To learn more about UNCTAD's work on trade facilitation, please visit: http://unctad.org/tf.

As of February 2019, 114 WTO developing and least-developed members have made these notifications, in part or in whole. Of those 114 countries, 63 developing and LDC members have classified measures under category C, signifying a need for TACB support. Implementation support has been requested with respect to each and every measure of the agreement by at least one WTO Member. However, certain measures of the TFA are in higher demand for support than others. The TFA measures that have been identified by developing and LDC members as most in need of TACB implementation support are listed in Figure 6.2, below.[6]

Figure 6.2. TFA Measures: Highest Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Demand[7]



Source: WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF) Database

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953470


Single Window is the one measure of the agreement that the clear majority of developing and LDC members making category C notifications have expressed a need for implementation support. High demand on this particular measure is likely due to the complexity of designing and implementing a National Single Window, which typically requires integration of the processes and controls of multiple border agencies, involves an ICT component, and requires a governance and legislative framework, among other conditions.

This list of high TACB demand measures may also suggest the authorities in developing and LDCs that are in particular need of support. A common characteristic of the majority of the listed measures is that their implementation falls under the responsibility of border authorities other than, or in addition to, the customs administration controls (such as the border authorities responsible for sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) and enforcing product standards and technical regulations (i.e. measures falling under the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreement) and/or requires multi-agency coordination. This need is consistent with experience in developing countries and LDC, where it is commonly found that the customs administration is often further advanced in the trade facilitation agenda than its border agency counterparts.

Pursuant to TFA Article 16, the category C notification shall include "for transparency purposes" an indication of the types of implementation support the WTO member requires per TFA measure.[8] Nineteen of the 63 countries that have made category C notifications to date have not included this information.[9] However, with respect to the remaining 44 countries, where this information is provided, the types of assistance in highest demand are those listed in Figure 6.3.[10]

As indicated by Figure 6.3, over 75% of the category C notifications request capacity building support and/or awareness raising on some or all the subject measures. TFA measures requiring the heaviest demand for such capacity building support are indicated in Figure 6.4.


Figure 6.3. TFA Measures: Support Types Requested



Source: WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF) Database

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953489

Figure 6.4. TFA Measures: Requests for Awareness-Raising and Capacity Building Support




Source: WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF) Database

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953508

Demand for support for assessment and drafting enabling laws and implementing regulations is also relatively high. Apart from advance rulings – a procedure unique to Customs - these high TACB demands suggest a need for support in developing laws and regulations apart from or in addition to the customs legislation (e.g. general administrative legislation on publication, administrative appeals, or rule-making).

Figure 6.5. TFA Measures: Highest Demand for Legislation Support




Source: WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF) Database

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953527

Requests for trade facilitation-related "hardware" – e.g. ICT, equipment, physical facilities – appear to be highest in relation to implementation of the transparency-related measures, such as websites to support publication obligations, or ICT support for Single Window implementation, and to the TFA measures that would typically implemented by the technical border authorities other than Customs (e.g. Plant Quarantine, Food Safety or Standards authority), such as laboratory equipment and testing facilities; storage facilities for perishable goods; and IT support for establishment of "rapid alert" notifications for food and feed.

Figure 6.6. TFA Measures: Requests for ICT, Infrastructure and Equipment Support



Source: WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF) Database

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953546

Finally, note that 22 WTO members - 12 of which are LDCs - have not yet ratified the agreement. Approximately 40 WTO members have not yet submitted or completed notification of their categories. And, where a WTO LDC member made category C notifications, in most cases the country indicated that the types of technical assistance that it requires for implementation is "to be determined." These gaps suggest there continues to be a need for technical assistance to support these WTO members' complete ratification and notification obligations and identify their implementation support requirements. The joint OECD-WTO M&E exercise highlighted the underlying rationale of Members and some regional economic communities in pursuing trade facilitation reforms. Box 6. 2 provides further details.

Box 6.2. Comments from developing country respondents on trade facilitation

"*The aid-for-trade priorities that have been taken into account with our development partners are the implementation of the Trade Facilitation Agreement within the framework of the World Trade Organization and the implementation of the SADC Free Trade Agreement.*" – **Angola**

"*Trade facilitation is important for connection to regional and global value chain. Challenges include coordination of multiple actors. Key policies include ECOWAS Customs Code and ECOWAS Trade Liberalisation Scheme (ETLS). Aid-for-trade support has been impactful in the completion and handing over of two joint border posts.*" – **Economic Community of West African States Secretariat**

"*El Salvador continues with the implementation of the Trade Facilitation Agreement and the Regional Strategy for trade facilitation and competitiveness, as well as advancing the process of regional integration, all with the purpose of increasing the capacities of Micro, Small and Medium-sized companies for their insertion in international trade and take advantage of the commercial opening derived from the Free Trade Agreements.*" - **El Salvador**

"*In terms of trade facilitation, we wish our practices to be consistent with the principles of the multilateral system in place to facilitate trade.*" – **Gabon**

"*Trade facilitation is a major objective to be achieved in Guinea's economic development process as a factor contributing to the promotion and enhancement of Guinea's trade capacity. Trade facilitation, training and information for women in modern trade techniques (compliance with export standards and documentation requirements) greatly assist women in their empowerment.*" - **Guinea**

"*Trade facilitation to improve cross border trading with our only neighbour the Republic of South Africa is being pursued. Funding is needed to expedite the process.*" – **Lesotho**

"*The ongoing creation of the Trade Facilitation Committee and its piloting, the strengthening of the capacities of the Single Window in the sense of digitisation and the interconnection of this Window with the structures involved (Customs, Taxes, Insurance, Banks, National Directorate of Veterinary Services, National Directorate of Agriculture, National Directorate of Industry), the treatment of essential products within the framework of the Trade Portal Platform, support to the MERCATOR programme at Customs level.*" – **Mali**

"*The PENX (National Strategic Export Plan) recognises that trade facilitation is relevant because of its impact on competitiveness by helping to streamline and reduce the cost of trade. PENX incorporates it as one of its pillars. Likewise, the National Policy of Competitiveness and Productivity proposes to consolidate the system of trade facilitation and coordination among the entities involved, as well as the mechanisms to fight against customs crimes such as smuggling that are linked to high informality and low financial intermediation.*" – **Peru**

"*On trade facilitation, Togo aims to become a logistics hub of excellence and a first-class business centre in the sub-region (Strategic Axis 1 of the National Development Plan), based on its strategic positioning and in serving landlocked countries from the autonomous port of Lomé.*" - **Togo**

"*Zimbabwe has requested technical capacity training from the WTO, UNCTAD and UNIDO for Trade Facilitation, trade in services and industrial policy implementation.*" – **Zimbabwe**

Source: Joint OECD-WTO *Monitoring and evaluation exercise* 2019


Focus of WB-TFSP Activities

In the years leading up to the entry into force of the agreement (and continuing thereafter, albeit at decreasing levels), the greatest demand was made for support on determining alignment of the country's trade regime to the provisions of agreement, identifying potential TACB needs and priorities, finalising Category A, B, and C commitments, and developing the national implementation strategies and action plans. Since inception of the program, the WB-TFSP has conducted over 50 such gap assessment missions for these purposes.

As countries move from the assessment and planning stage, demand for technical support has progressed toward implementation. As is clear from notifications made to the WTO Trade Facilitation Committee and the results of national needs assessments conducted prior to entry into force of the agreement, the level of alignment and support needs are varied among different countries and within different border agencies in a given country. Nevertheless, certain general patterns have emerged in provision of support. At present, the largest measure of technical assistance and capacity building support is generally concentrated on a select number of measures of the agreement. This concentration is not by chance, but the result of both client demand and a sequencing strategy applied by the countries concerned.

Thus, as indicated in Figure 6.7., more than one-third of all countries in the program have received technical support to establish or improve the operation of their respective National Trade Facilitation Committees (NTFC). Priority is given to establishment of the NTFC because it is an obligation of the agreement applicable to all WTO members from the date of entry into force of the TFA. Moreover, consistent with the agreement, establishment of an operational NTFC is seen by the countries concerned, as well as donor organisations, as essential to overseeing and managing implementation of the agreement, including prioritisation and coordination of reforms and technical assistance. The rationale for concentration to date on the other measures in Figure 6.7 largely follows a similar sequencing logic.

Figure 6.7. Percent of Countries Supported on Specific TFA Measures



Source: World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Program Data

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953565

Risk management, the fundamental principle for the exercise of border inspection and control, is a precondition to the proper operation of other Customs-related measures of the TFA, such as those on Authorised Operators and Customs post-clearance audit, and has a direct impact on time and cost of clearance. There is therefore high priority demand for technical assistance and capacity building to implement risk management systems and procedures of the customs and other border agencies, such as veterinary and food safety authorities, as well as integration of those controls.

A **time-release study** provides the country with an initial baseline by which progress and impact of implementation of trade facilitation reforms can be measured and therefore is important for early implementation. The WB-TFSP has supported baseline and subsequent time release studies in approximately a dozen countries to date.

Box 6.3. TRS+ - a fuller picture of time incurred

Gaining insight into the time it takes for goods to pass through a border and the time to undertake other regulatory requirements to either import or export is an important element in identifying key bottlenecks and areas for trade facilitation and modernisation. The World Customs Organization Time Release Study (WCO TRS) is an approach to measure the time taken for goods to complete all the processes associated with clearance and release at the border for export and import as well as for goods in transit.

The WCO TRS, however, does not measure the time businesses incur to comply with regulatory requirements before the goods are presented at the border. These include obtaining the necessary certificates, licenses, and permits and meeting customs requirements to import and export. These processes take time, thus imposing a time cost on businesses.

To get a fuller picture of time required to comply with trade requirements, the WB-TFSP developed a "Time Release Study Plus (TRS+)" approach that measures both clearance and release processes as well as the regulatory processes "away from the border." TRS+ has been piloted in Eswatini and Lesotho, and the methodology has been shared with the WCO with the aim of collaborating on deploying this enhanced methodology in upcoming projects


Analysis of existing **formalities and documentation** requirements is a first step toward rationalisation and coordination of border agency processes and is, for example, necessary for Single Window implementation. Country experience shows that often this rationalisation of documents and formalities follows, and results from, analysis of a time release study, which reveals bottlenecks and inefficient processes.

Single Window is identified in notifications of developing and LDC countries as the single TFA measure most requiring implementation support,[11] a level of demand that appears also in the group of countries supported by the WB-TFSP. Greatest initial need for support for the national Single Window implementation is strategic planning; in particular, assisting the various government agencies involved in the development and operation of the national single window and private sector representatives to establish at the outset a common "vision" on all critical issues – governance, legal, functional, operational and financing models and strategies, technical scope, and capacity building – to ensure implementation will be consistent with expectations.

Demand for support for the **transparency** measures of the agreement has been in establishing or maintaining Trade Information Portals, or electronic portals that make cross-border information, such as regulatory information, easily available. To that end, the WB-TFSP has facilitated the establishment and design, or assisted in implementation of six portals in countries in East and South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and the Caribbean.

To date, the form of support most commonly required of the WB-TFSP in relation to implementation of these priority measures has been technical expertise such as the "know-how" and international "best practice" experience necessary to design and implement a time release study, to develop a risk-based sampling framework for the animal health, or to set up an effective stakeholder consultation mechanism, to indicate a few of the typical kinds of technical support activities that have been undertaken to date.

Figure 6.8. Forms of Assistance Provided 2017-2018



Source: World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Program Data


StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953584

In these early years of implementation of the TFA, there has also been high demand for advisory support to establish the general policy and strategic framework for trade facilitation reform, particularly support for development or validation of national and regional trade facilitation strategic and action plans and the Single Window "visioning" work that is described above. There is also significant demand for support for review of laws and, where required, drafting amendments or new legislation to enable proper implementation of the agreement. Support has been provided, for example, on revision of customs acts, legislation to enable electronic exchange of information, animal health and quarantine laws, and legal measures to establish the NTFC, among others.

Demand for capacity building is also significant and will likely increase as new or changed laws, policies and procedures are put into operation.

Technical assistance and capacity building support has been directed largely to the public sector to date. As indicated by Figure 6.9, the government – which here refers to the executive authority and ministries of commerce, trade, foreign affairs – is the public sector counterpart with whom support activities have been most frequently conducted in this initial period. This includes support for developing and/or validating strategy and implementation plans, establishing the NTFC, and preparing notifications and ratification of the agreement.

Figure 6.9. Public Sector Recipients of Support



Source: World Bank Trade Facilitation Support Program Data

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953603

As implementation continues to progress, the focus of support will shift to Customs and the other border agencies. Given that many of the provisions of the agreement fall under Customs implementation responsibility, Customs has and will likely continue to demand a large share of support. However, efforts have been made to direct attention to the technical agencies, particularly the SPS and Standards authorities, whose interventions at the border can have significant impacts on time and cost of trade. As previously noted, it is frequently the case that these technical authorities are not as aware of, or as advanced in, the trade facilitation agenda as the national customs authority. Customs often has acceded to and/or implemented the Revised Kyoto Convention and other WCO trade facilitation instruments, received capacity building support in trade facilitation and, as a consequence, is often much further advanced in terms of modernised facilitative procedures, controls and technology. Typically, for example, the Customs authority is partially or fully automated while other border authorities continue with manual, paper-based processes.

Implementation Progress and Impact of Reforms

In this section, we discuss the progress and impact of implementation.

By "progress", we mean the extent to which the trade facilitation regime within individual countries has been brought into alignment with the WTO TFA provisions. "Impact" refers to the effect, economic or otherwise, resulting from implementation progress in these countries.

Implementation Progress

To assist countries in monitoring their individual progress in implementation of the TFA, the WB-TFSP developed a "TFA Alignment Tracking Tool." This tool enables a country to measure alignment with respect to each of the TFA technical measures across three dimensions-

- the extent to which the legal or policy measures required to enable implementation of the particular measure are in place;
- the extent to which operational or administrative procedures have been developed to implement the TFA measure;
- the extent to which the measure is applied in practice.

The measurements take a whole of government approach, which means that all agencies relevant to the particular trade facilitation measure should be aligned with the TFA's requirements in order for a country to receive full credit.[12] Moreover, the tool measures progress from the perspective of a *full and effective* implementation of the agreement. That is, although the TFA legal obligation with respect to certain measures may be limited to "best efforts," trade facilitation benefits are greater where the country adopts a more ambitious implementation posture.[13] For example, while TFA Article 7.4 requires border authorities other than Customs to focus controls on high risk consignments and expedite the release of low risk consignments "to the extent possible," the tracking tool recognises a country's full alignment with Article 7.4 only if such border authorities in fact adopt and apply in practice such risk management principles.

Since 2015, baseline measurements have been recorded for some 24 countries and subsequent updates to the baselines have been done for 18 countries. These limited measurements to date indicate progress showing that overall TFA alignment has risen from an average of 45 percent to 53 percent, with largest improvements made with respect to implementation of TFA measures on publication and the National Trade Facilitation Committee.

Apart from measuring progress, the WB-TFSP tracking tool and methodology provide a useful perspective of the actual state of implementation on the ground. There appear to be discrepancies between the state of implementation as measured by the tracking tool and the notifications made by developing and LDC members.

Table 6.2. Percentage of countries aligned: comparison of Tracking Tool Assessments and Category A Notifications

		WB-TFSP Tracking Tool Baseline (% of countries fully aligned)	Category A Notifications (% of countries fully aligned)
10.1	Formalities and Documents	0	61%
7.6	Average Release Times	7%	52%
10.4	Single Window	3%	39%
1.3	Enquiry Point	0	54%
6.1	General Disciplines	0	60%
5.1	Notification Enhanced Inspections	3%	61%
6.2	Specific Disciplines Fees	7%	66%
7.7	Authorised Operators	0	46%
2.2	Consultations	7%	62%
10.2	Copies	7%	64%

Table 6.2 lists the bottom 10 TFA measures (least aligned) in terms of lowest average alignment of all countries tracked. Comparison with data from WTO notifications indicate further discrepancies in perspective of alignment.[14]

These discrepancies in views of the level of alignment may be due to differences in the populations measured. The countries in the WB-TFSP are a subset of the 114 WTO member countries that have made Category A notifications, and the WB-TFSP includes a higher share of LDCs. It may also be due to use of a different standard of alignment. As noted, the WB-TFSP tracking tool measures alignment in terms of "full and effective" implementation of the agreement, whereas Category A notifications may have been made by the countries concerned on basis of other factors, including an assessment of technical legal compliance.

Impact of Reforms

Data available indicate that TACB is having a positive impact on factors that affect time as well as cost of clearance of goods. These factors include the number of physical or documentary checks (reduced as a result of implementation of risk-based controls); number of fees and documents required for clearance (reduced or eliminated through process simplifications); and number of manual processes (reduced through automation of documents and processes) .

Box 6.4. Select country impacts reported

- Import cargo selected for red channel (physical inspection) *reduced* by 48% (**Ethiopia 2014-2018**)
- Obligation to present copies of tax certificates and bill of lading for export *eliminated* (**Ethiopia 2017**)
- Certificate of origin *automated* (**Ethiopia 2017**)
- Number of products requiring import permits *reduced* (**Liberia 2016**)
- Number of documents required for export *reduced*; cargo terminal handling fees *eliminated* through implementation of simplified "local" clearance procedure (**Montenegro 2018**)
- Import cargo sent to "green channel" (no inspection) *increased* by 32% (**Nepal 2016-2017**)
- Import cargo selected for red channel (physical inspection) *reduced* by 54% (**São Tomé and Príncipe 2018**)

Various metrics can be used to determine the impact of trade facilitation reforms over time and, therefore, indicate the efficacy of technical assistance and capacity building. These include time release studies; trade facilitation surveys; and nationally (or regionally) defined performance indicators. These are discussed in turn in the following sections.

Assessing Impact with Time Release Studies

Given the overall trade facilitation purpose of the agreement is to "further expedit[e] the movement, release and clearance of goods, including goods in transit,"[15] time is a critical metric to determine overall impact of reforms.

In principle, a properly structured TRS – conducted periodically in a consistent manner over the period during which the reforms are put into operation – will provide reliable data for this measurement.[16]

While the initial baseline TRS's have been completed with TACB support in some 30 countries, fewer countries have yet repeated the measurement. These initial results do suggest that in those countries where the TRS has been repeated, technical assistance and capacity building has in fact contributed to important reductions in clearance times.

Table 6.3. Results of time release studies

Country	TACB-Supported Reforms	Time Reduction
1. Bangladesh (port of Chittagong)	■ Simplification of procedures ■ National border agency coordination ■ Risk management ■ Trade Portal ■ NTFC ■ IT (on-line licensing module) ■ TRS ■ Legislation	22.7% (11 days -> 8.5 days)
2. Timor-Leste (port of Dili))	■ Risk management ■ NTFC ■ TRS ■ Legislation	62.6% (15.06 days-> 5.63 days)
3. Guatemala -Honduras (land border/pilot study)	■ Cross-border coordination (Joint Border Post) ■ Electronic document ■ Simplification/integration of procedures ■ IT (customs processing system) ■ Legislation	97.5% (10 hours -> 15 minutes)

Assessing Impact with World Bank and OECD Country Surveys and Indicators

Other perspectives from which the impact of trade-facilitation reforms might be assessed are the World Bank periodic country surveys – the annual Doing Business report and the biennial Logistics Performance Index ("LPI") – and the OECD Trade Indicators, updated on a two-year cycle.

The World Bank Doing Business report records the time and cost associated with the logistical process of exporting and importing goods. A single "Trading Across Borders" score is calculated for each country each year based on the time and cost (excluding tariffs) associated with documentary compliance (i.e. to obtain, prepare, process and submit documents required of all government agencies to complete the transaction) and border compliance (i.e. customs clearance as well as inspection procedures conducted by other agencies). The World Bank LPI survey includes an assessment of the "efficiency" of the clearance process, which is defined as the speed, simplicity and predictability of formalities by Customs and other border agencies.

Box 6.5.The OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators (TFIs)

The OECD TFIs were developed to support the negotiation and implementation of the TFA. They are the most precisely targeted instrument for monitoring and benchmarking worldwide country performance on trade facilitation in existence today.

The TFIs mirror the substantive provisions covered by Section I of the TFA, from Article I on Publication and Availability of Information through to Article 12 on Customs Cooperation. Each indicator is composed of several specific and fact-based variables related to existing trade-related policies and regulations and their implementation in practice. The TFIs measure the actual extent to which countries have introduced and implemented trade facilitation measures and their performance relative to others.

The TFI database covers 163 countries, including economies at all income levels, as well as all geographical regions. Every two years, publicly available information and direct submissions from countries are combined with factual data from the private sector, so as to relate applicable regulation to a practitioner's account on how things work on the ground. The OECD verifies discrepancies with the aim of ensuring accurate information that is geographically comparable and consistent over time.

The TFIs are used to monitor and benchmark country performance on trade facilitation, helping policy makers assess the state of their trade facilitation efforts, pinpoint challenges and identify opportunities for progress. They also play a valuable role in helping identify and prioritise technical assistance and capacity-building needs.

The TFIs dataset allows for comparisons by income group, geographical group and among regional grouping members; for examination of the state of play by individual trade facilitation measure; and for assessing performance evolution over time. They are also used as an evaluation tool to assess the economic impact of trade facilitation reforms and in particular of implementation of the TFA.


The 2017 dataset showed that at the moment of entry into force of the TFA implementation of measures covered by the Agreement was well underway, although performance varied across and within different income groups in most policy areas. There have been early improvements in areas such as automation and streamlining of procedures and engagement with the trade community. By far the biggest challenges are in the areas of domestic and cross-border agency cooperation. The introduction and use of information technologies and the establishment of Single Windows are amongst the most expensive elements of trade facilitation, but the biggest challenges relate to changing attitudes and culture around border procedures, so training is critically important.

Source: **OECD (2018).**

Improvements do appear in both the Doing Business and LPI indicators for those countries implementing the TFA with WB-TFSP support, as indicated in Figure 6.10.

It may take some time before TFA reform activities appear in improved Doing Business and LPI indicators. The Doing Business and LPI time and cost measurements are based on surveys of logistics and trade-related businesses operating in the country, and there can be a lag between the implementation of a reform and its perception by the surveyed members of the business community. Moreover, the most recent LPI survey was taken between February 2017 and February 2018, i.e. the first year of implementation of the TFA; similarly, data in the Doing Business 2019 report are current as of 1 May 2018. Nevertheless, these survey results, even if early in implementation of the TFA, indicate an encouraging positive trend.

Figure 6.10 Percentage Improvement in World Bank Trade Facilitation Indicators WB-TFSP Countries (2016-2019)



Source: World Bank Doing Business and Logistics Performance Index data

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953622

Other Perspectives (Assessing Impact through National/Regional Defined Performance Indicators)

The TRS and the international surveys and databases discussed in the foregoing paragraphs provide assessment of impact of reform in terms of time and cost of trade, and generally from the perspective of business. This is appropriate given the objectives of the agreement. However, there is also a distinct national perspective: countries will have broader economic or social development objectives that they hope to achieve through trade facilitation reforms, apart from reducing businesses' time and costs alone. These broader objectives might include, for example, regional integration, improving SME's access to international markets, export diversification, gender equality and women empowerment, etc.

OECD research highlights how small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are significant contributors to economic activity and employment in developed and developing countries. However, their participation in international trade, and therefore their ability to benefit from globalisation, remains limited relative to larger firms. Indeed, despite representing the majority of enterprises, SMEs are responsible for an average of 33% of exports in selected developed countries, and only 18% of exports in selected developing countries. Where imports are concerned, a similar pattern emerges; SMEs represent, on average, 40% of imports in developed countries and about 34% in a range of developing countries.


SMEs face limitations in terms of experience, productivity and access to finance, which make it harder to scale for international engagement, whether through imports or exports. In addition, the costs for shipping goods across borders can be particularly onerous for small firms, which lack specialised human resources to deal with procedural aspects and who may only ship infrequently or in small batches. This makes trade facilitation particularly important for SMEs seeking to engage in international trade. Measures can address fixed or variable costs of trading in turn affecting whether or not SMEs import or export (the extensive margin) or how much they import or export (the intensive margin) respectively. Box 6. 6 below highlights OECD research on SME experience internationalising through trade facilitation.

Box 6. 6. Helping SMEs Internationalise through Trade Facilitation *(continued on following page)*

The OECD sought to assess the relationship between the trade facilitation environment at the border – as measured through the OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators (TFIs) – and measures for international engagement of SMEs (using the World Bank Enterprise Survey –WBES – and the OECD Trade by Enterprise Characteristics – TEC). Several patterns in the relationship between SMEs and trade facilitation emerge from this analysis. While firms of all sizes from both developed and developing economies benefit from improvements in the overall trade facilitation environment, smaller firms appear to benefit relatively more than large firms.

Figure 6.11. Trade facilitation policy environment supporting SMEs versus large firms in developing economies

Effect of a 0.1 TFI improvement (average index of all 11 trade facilitation areas) on the probability of becoming an exporter or an importer)



Note: The figure presents percentage improvements in the probability to export (import) from marginal effects of the probit model(s). The shaded area refers to the 95% confidence interval around the estimated indicator effect.


Source: OECD (2019a) estimations based on the World Bank Enterprise Survey data.

Across both developed and developing economies, measures such as the inclusion of SMEs in consultation processes or the efficiency of appeal procedures – measures which can be associated with higher fixed costs of trading – have a greater impact on the propensity or probability of firms to engage in exporting and importing. In turn, measures such as fees and charges, streamlining of procedures and automating border processes, which tend to be associated with reductions in variable costs, have a bigger impact on the export and import values of firms.


Box 6. 6. Helping SMEs Internationalise through Trade Facilitation *(continued from previous page)*

Figure 6.12. Trade facilitation policy factors underpinning SMEs exports and imports in developing economies

Panel A: Effect of a 0.1 TFI improvement (by area) on the probability of becoming an exporter



Panel B: Effect of a 0.1 TFI improvement (by area) on the probability of importing



Note: Panel A presents percentage improvements in the probability to export from marginal effects of the probit model. Panel B presents percentage improvements in the probability to import from marginal effects of the probit model. The shaded area refers to the 95% confidence interval around the estimated indicator effect.

Source: OECD (2019a and b) estimations based on the World Bank Enterprise Survey data.

OECD research highlights that it is not only the trade facilitation environment in the domestic economy that matters. The environment that SMEs face in the exporting markets or in the origin economies of their imported inputs also affects their participation in, and gains from, trade. This underscores the potential of trade facilitation reforms to be a win-win outcome across countries, with benefits increasing if all countries act together. Moreover, improvements in the trade facilitation environment benefitting large firms might also support SMEs' indirect participation in international trade. Upstream and downstream linkages to larger firms can be vital for many SMEs, particularly in the context of global and regional value chains.

Ultimately, the OECD analysis suggests that trade facilitation reforms are not only efficiency-enhancing for firms of all sizes, but they also promote more inclusive outcomes, by helping to level the playing field between large and small firms. An encouraging message also emerges from the joint OECD-WTO M&E exercise in that Aid-for-trade financing for trade facilitation was considered one of the best ways to support the economic empowerment of MSMEs by 50 partner country respondents. Fifty-one partner country respondents also identified trade facilitation as an area in which aid-for-trade support provided has been impactful for economic diversification.

However, in order to fully reap the benefits of trade for SMEs, reforms in the identified trade facilitation areas need to be complemented with reforms and investments in other areas linked to firms' capacity to take advantage of new trade opportunities, including provision of digital infrastructure and support with the adoption of new technologies, and development of skills.

OECD research in Southeast Asia shows that, while greater participation of the region's SMEs in global and regional value chains is linked to employment generation, benefits are not always shared equally across genders. While importing SMEs in Indonesia generated more jobs for women than any other category of trading or non-trading firms, they generated even more employment for men.[17] Reporting to the joint OECD-WTO M&E exercise underscores this point. Aid-for-trade financing for trade facilitation was considered as in instrument to support women's economic empowerment by 38 partner country respondents.

Box 6.7. Montenegro Trade Facilitation Strategy *(continued on following page)*

In March 2018, the government of Montenegro formally adopted a National Trade Facilitation Strategy setting the direction and priorities of reforms for 2018-2022. The strategy was needed due to the country's various commitments at an international and regional level. These include the TFA, which Montenegro ratified in 2016; Additional Protocol 5 of the Central European Free Trade Area (CEFTA), which includes trade facilitation measures in addition to those of the TFA; and obligations arising out Montenegro's accession to the EU.

The goal of the strategy was to develop a realistic and unified approach to implementation of these commitments in a manner that will best achieve Montenegro's national economic development objectives. Moreover, the investment in on-going reform programs of the border agencies - such as work on integrated border management and Customs long-term business plans - and the limited resources available had to be taken into account.

The strategy was developed over an 8 month period by the National Trade Facilitation Committee, with technical support of the World Bank. Relevant border and government authorities, as well as private sector representatives, participated in the development of the strategy in a series of workshops to brainstorm, draft and refine the document.

The finished product –comprised of a strategy and detailed action plan – designates priority trade facilitation measures to be implemented by 2023, and defines implementation responsibilities of border agencies (as well as private sector), actions and time lines. Most importantly, the national strategy sets out key performance indicators (KPIs) for each action, agreed by stakeholders, that will be used by the NTFC to measure progress and impact.

Box 6.7. Montenegro Trade Facilitation Strategy *(continued from previous page)*

Figure 6.13. Montenegro Trade Facilitation Strategy 2018-2022 Action Plan KPI's (excerpts)

MEASURE 1.1. INCREASE AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY OF INFORMATION

Government competent authorities will publish and keep regularly updated, information and forms concerning import, export and transit requirements, in compliance with the TFA and the CEFTA AP 5.

Indicator	Value		Timeframe		Outcome
	Start	Target	Start year	End year	
1. Percentage of information published pursuant to Articles 1.1. and 1.2. of the Trade Facilitation Agreement and CEFTA AP 5;	To be established	100%	Article 1.1 and CEFTA AP5.: 2018	Article 1.1. and CEFTA AP 5: 2019	All information required to be published under TFA article 1.1 and CEFTA AP 5 is easily accessible on the websites of the relevant government competent authorities, including description of procedures for importation, exportation, and transit, procedures for appeal or review, required forms and documents, etc.

MEASURE 3.2. EXPAND USE OF SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURES

The Customs Administration, in coordination with the Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Authority and business associations, will develop and implement programs to increase the use of simplified import and export procedures by economic operators.

Indicator	Value		Timeframe		Outcome
	Start	Target	Start year	End year	
1. Percentage of declarations processed within simplified procedures in relation to the total number of declarations.	2%	min 40%	2018	2020	At least 40 percent of total declarations are made under simplified procedures.

MEASURE 5.3. DEVELOP THE FOOD SAFETY INFORMATION SYSTEM

The Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Authority will develop an automated system to support veterinary, sanitary and phytosanitary inspection officer's border control activities and enable paperless processing of supporting documents for import export and transit of goods subject to SPS requirements, without the requirement of a paper copy.

Indicator	Value		Timeframe		Outcome
	Start	Target	Start year	End year	
1. Percentage of automated transactions in relation to the total number of transactions of the FSVPA.	0	70%	2019	2022	70 percent of the Food Safety Veterinary and Phytosanitary Authority transactions are fully automated.

The National Trade Facilitation Strategy is published on Montenegro government websites.

Establishment of a monitoring and evaluation framework is critical in the planning of national implementation. However, the data needed to measure progress and impact against these broader national objectives needs to be created. An important activity, undertaken in planning national implementation, is to agree on these national objectives; identify and prioritise the trade facilitation measures that will achieve those objectives; and, define the indicators and processes to be used to measure progress and assess the impact of implementation in relation to those national objectives. It is an activity appropriately undertaken by the NTFC, with strong private sector involvement, and produces a formal agreed national trade facilitation strategy or similar action plan.

FACILITATION OF E-COMMERCE TRADE

This section examines how customs and other border clearance functions are adapting to the challenge of e-commerce and how aid for trade is supporting this process.

Although "e-commerce," as commonly defined, includes both national and international sales of both goods and services[18] , the focus of these comments is limited to the trade facilitation aspects of the e-commerce transaction, namely, the cross-border delivery of physical goods purchased on-line.

General Characteristics

The characteristics of the cross-border e-commerce market have been the subject of previous studies and analyses.[19] The largest portion of the e-commerce retail market involves individual, small-size packages containing low value goods. Typically, the seller undertakes to deliver the goods direct to the consumer's door or to a local "pick-up point", contracting with the postal service or an express-delivery operator who assumes responsibility for clearance at export and import.[20] Reliability of the seller; speed of delivery; ability to track and trace a package from the point of dispatch to delivery; and ability to return goods easily are the key demands of e-commerce consumers. Given that speed of delivery is an essential feature, air transport is typically involved.

The e-commerce market is reported to be large and growing rapidly. Although measurement of e-commerce is problematic, what information is available suggests at a minimum the proportions and trend of the market. Survey and other data from consulting firms, for example, indicate that by 2021 global retail e-commerce sales will increase over 250% to USD 4.8 trillion from a 2014 base of USD 1.3 trillion sales.[21] The size of the B2B e-commerce market appears to be more impressive still; total B2B e-commerce sales in some countries have been estimated as constituting 60 to 90 percent of the total e-commerce market.[22] Cross-border sales account for a significant and increasing share of the e-commerce market. In 2015, cross-border sales constituted 15% of the e-commerce market and are expected to grow to approximately 22% of global e-commerce by 2020.[23]

On-line platforms and marketplaces (such as Amazon, eBay, Alibaba and Wish, as well as home-grown developing country platforms such as Jumia) provide a ready-made and cost-effective infrastructure to enable firms in developing and least-developed countries to access global markets. By enabling firms to reach overseas buyers directly via the internet, the costs of travel or physical presence in the export markets or use of intermediaries is reduced or eliminated. Moreover, these e-commerce marketplaces offer services to sellers to more easily engage with third-parties for logistics and delivery of goods.

E-commerce market thus creates new export opportunities for SME's, which constitute the largest portion of firms in most developing countries, benefits consumers through lower prices and greater range of choices, and benefits government through new job creation, increased exports, and competitive pressure in the economy.[24] However, the rapidly increasing volumes and the nature of e-commerce trade presents specific challenges for Customs and other border agencies, which may require a particular focus to implementation of trade facilitation measures. These are discussed in the following sections.

Facilitating E-Commerce Cross Border Trade


In a general sense, the trade facilitation issues arising out of the cross-border delivery of goods that have been purchased via a website are identical to those where the export sale is concluded in person, in writing or other such traditional means. That is, goods shipped by an e-commerce seller are subject to the same border controls, document and data requirements, customs formalities, fees, etc. required for release and clearance as goods that are sold through traditional channels. A *full and effective* implementation of the TFA measures to eliminate inefficiencies in clearance processing, rationalise fees, improve transparency of requirements, integrate border agencies processing and control activities, etc., will reduce costs of trade and thereby increase firms' competitiveness in international markets and reduce prices paid by consumers, regardless of the purchase channel.

However, it is also well-recognised that certain facilitation measures are of particular importance to support cross-border e-commerce trade, given its specific characteristics, and which should therefore be given emphasis by governments in their implementation of the TFA to support growth of this trade. These key e-commerce facilitating measures are the following -

■ *De minimis* duty and tax exemptions

The TFA requires WTO members to "provide, to the extent possible, for a *de minimis* shipment value or dutiable amount for which customs duties and taxes will not be collected."[25] As the terms of the measure indicate, the *de minimis* threshold may be defined in terms of the value of the goods or, less-commonly, the amount of duty and tax payable or a combination of the value and duty and tax amount.

Figure 6.14. *De minimis* Customs Duty Amounts in 98 Countries (Global Express Association)[26]



Source: https://global-express.org/assets/files/Customs%20Committee/de-minimis/GEA%20overview%20on%20de%20minimis_28%20March%202018.pdf

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953641

The *de minimis* exemption is of specific importance to B2C e-commerce trade. As noted above, the largest share of packages delivered in the B2C channel are low value, and therefore would benefit from an appropriate *de minimis* exemption or waiver. Moreover, apart from the savings in tax and duty, operation of a *de minimis* can reduce time and cost of customs clearance by eliminating processing steps otherwise required for payment and collection. And, as discussed below, a *de minimis* rule is important to support implementation of certain simplified release procedures.

As indicated in Figure 6.14, a *de minimis* rule is not yet established in some countries. Where it is provided, the threshold amount allowed may be minimal or subject to restrictive conditions. Also, where the amount is specified in legislation, there may not be provided any legal or administrative mechanism for periodic adjustment, so that the rule can lose its facilitative effect over time (absent regular amendment of the customs law).

The traditional justification for the exemption is that the administrative costs incurred by the trader and Customs in assessment, payment and collection would equal or exceed the amount of the duty and tax at stake. However, it would be important in setting the threshold to examine not only these administrative savings but overall economic impact, such as positive economic benefits of increased e-commerce transactions.

A challenge that developing and least-developed countries face in implementation of a *de minimis* rule is the impact on revenue collection and, possibly, domestic producers. There is also a concern of fraud in the use of the exemption by, for example, misdeclaration of price paid. Technical assistance and capacity building support will be important to assist government in analysing these impacts, devising an appropriate facilitative *de minimis* threshold, and establishing appropriate risk management and procedures to reduce the potential of mis-use.

■ Simplified release procedures

The TFA requires WTO members to establish simplified documentation and procedures for release of expedited shipments, such as packages arriving by air express delivery services, a category that describes much of e-commerce cross-border transactions.[27] These TFA provisions envisage the possibility of customs clearance and release of express shipments on the basis of air cargo documents or a simplified declaration alone, as well as release followed by a subsequent declaration and completion of clearance procedures (for example, for purposes of assessment and payments of any duty and tax owed). It is further envisaged that countries may limit the use of these simplifications to authorised persons or entities, such as express delivery operators with the systems and procedures in place to ensure proper conduct of the operation and enable customs supervision.

The leading instrument to guide implementation of these TFA principles is the WCO Immediate Release Guidelines.[28]

The simplifications described by Category 2, which is linked to the *de minimis* exemption discussed above, and by Category 3 would cover a large portion of B2C transactions. As the WCO guidelines indicate, however, it is up to the country concerned to design these simplifications and define conditions of their use in a manner appropriate to their particular needs and environment.

There is large scope for technical assistance and capacity building support to developing and LDC members which have not yet implemented these simplifications. Implementation of these procedures may constitute a radical alteration of existing, traditional clearance processes. Expertise and capacity building would be important in the design of the procedures and minimum document and data requirements; establishing qualification criteria and controls of express delivery and other potential users of these simplifications; implementation of an appropriate guarantee system; evaluation and adjustments to customs IT systems, etc.

Box 6.8. WCO Immediate Release Guidelines

The WCO Guidelines are recommendations to customs administrations to assist in development of their national procedures to cope with the increasing volumes of smaller consignments crossing borders as a result of the growth in the e-commerce market. They are intended as possible "solutions" to enable administrations to combine the immediate release of such goods with relevant and appropriate controls.

The guidelines recommend that consignments may be separated into four categories, each with suggested release treatment and data and documentary requirements.

- **Category 1: Correspondence and documents**
  - Goods cleared and released simultaneously (i.e. no post-release documents or procedures)
  - Goods released on basis of a "consolidated declaration" such as a manifest or waybill
  - Minimal data required
- **Category 2: Low value consignments for which no duties and taxes are collected (*de minimis* threshold)**
  - Goods cleared and released simultaneously
  - Goods released on basis of a "consolidated declaration" or a simplified declaration
  - Individual items in shipment reported
- **Category 3: Low value dutiable consignments (simplified declaration)**
  - Goods cleared and released simultaneously, if a simplified or full declaration submitted prior to arrival and any duty and tax is assessed and paid
  - Otherwise, goods immediately released on basis of manifest/waybill or provisional declaration, subject to provision of a guarantee and obligation to submit simplified (including periodic) declaration following release and pay duty and tax
- **Category 4: High Value consignments (full declaration)**
  - Normal clearance and release procedures apply

Under any category, Customs may perform documentary checks and/or physical examination of the goods based on risk management.

The guidelines include an indicative list of data elements required under categories 1 to 3.


Pre-arrival information

The TFA requires WTO members to allow submission of documentation and other information required for importation – including both the manifest and goods declaration documents and information – prior to arrival of the goods so as to enable Customs and other border authorities to process the information (determine required controls, assess duty and taxes, etc.) in advance and thereby expedite release. Moreover, provision should be made, "as appropriate," for the electronic submission of this advance information.

In their notifications to the WTO Committee, the majority of WTO developing and LDC members indicate that they have, in fact, already implemented these provisions on pre-arrival processing (Category A).

Moreover, of the 16 countries that notified the WTO Committee that they intend to implement the procedure with a delay period but without need of external technical assistance (Category B), more than half indicate that the measure will be implemented by the end of 2020.

Figure 6.15. TFA Article 7.1 Pre-arrival Processing: Implementation Notifications



Source: WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF) Database

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953660

Full and effective implementation of pre-arrival processing in the context of e-commerce trade presents developing and LDC Customs and other border authorities with specific challenges not present to the same degree as in traditional channels. Given levels of automation, declarations for small parcels moving through the international postal channel are less likely to be submitted in electronic form or in advance. Because national legislation typically allows release on the basis of simplified declarations for low value goods (e.g. based on the immediate release procedures described above), less data is available to border authorities for risk analysis purposes. The occasional shippers who typically participate in in e-commerce transactions may not be known to Customs (i.e. traders with no compliance history) and, because they are typically not well-practiced in customs requirements, the data provided may not be as reliable. Thus, while the rate of implementation of TFA Article 7.1 appears high, it may be that additional focus, with appropriate TACB support, should be given to overcome these particular challenges to expedited release of goods in the e-commerce arena. In particular, implementation of the various initiatives of WCO and Universal Postal Union (UPU) for advance electronic exchange of postal data might be supported.[29]

■ Simplified procedures for re-export/re-import of returns

To grow the cross-border e-commerce market, consumer demand requires facilitation of return of goods to the seller and possibly, shipment of replacement goods. Implementation of simplified Customs procedures to expedite the re-export (by the consumer) and re-importation (by the seller), as well as duty and tax facilities, including a simplified drawback regime, would therefore be important to respond to this demand.

■ Border agency coordination

Full and effective implementation of the TFA provisions on border agency coordination and cooperation are essential. The facilitation benefit of Customs immediate release of an air cargo express delivery is limited if the operator must wait for approval of other border authorities, such as quarantine services. Alignment of border authorities' presence and working hours at air cargo facilities, integration of their processing and controls, and sharing pre-arrival and risk related information are essential to expedite release.

Coordination with national postal services (public and private) is of particular importance in view of the large and growing volume of parcels and express mail service (EMS) items that move through the international postal supply chain *and* that the clearance of such postal items is a shared responsibility of Customs and the postal service. As postal service processes are often manual and paper-based, there is evident need for technical or other assistance to simplify and integrate clearance processes, and to enable automated exchange of data with Customs, consistent with UPU and WCO standards and recommendations.

TACB for e-Commerce

The essential elements of a B2C e-commerce transaction are (i) a seller with an internet presence (a web page) to accept on-line orders, (ii) a buyer with internet access to place the order, (iii) a payment method (e.g. credit card, digital wallets, cash on delivery, etc.), and (iv) the delivery of goods.[30] Apart from the trade facilitation issues arising out of cross-border delivery of goods as discussed above, developing and least-developed countries face specific challenges in relation to each of these elements. These barriers include unreliable ICT infrastructure and power supply, limited access to international electronic payment systems, weak legal framework for electronic transactions, and poor distribution and logistics infrastructure. A valuable resource that can assist these countries identify specific barriers and the technical assistance and capacity support required to participate more fully in the e-commerce market is UNCTAD's "eTrade Readiness Assessment."


Box 6. 9. Trade Facilitation and E-commerce: Two sides of a coin

Although e-commerce involves online buying and selling, it still depends on the physical delivery of goods. Poor logistics remain a barrier to cross border e-commerce transaction in many developing economies. While transport costs are coming down and shipping connectivity has improved, the gap between the best and worst connected countries is widening and transport cost and delivery time often remain too high. Improving customs clearance, simplified border procedures and facilitating e-commerce and ameliorate interoperability between transport providers is an all-time high priority for these economies.

Such has been the reflection of the eTrade Readiness Assessment conducted by UNCTAD in 17 LDCs while investigating the e-commerce readiness assessment. Outstanding elements that are parts of the Trade Logistic measures are present in the findings of the assessment reports. Issues ranging from the Single Window to coordination between trade support institutions have been labelled to be very important.

Feedback from the survey indicates that trade logistics and cross border facilitation measures are crucially important to establish a full-fledged e-commerce domain. It goes to show that policy makers must specifically focus their trade facilitation reforms on trade logistic and trade facilitation measures both within the country as well as across the border. Digitalisation and enhanced coordination between trade support institution can help foster a sustainable and competitive e-commerce regime.

Figure 6.16. Elements very important to create an environment conducive to ecommerce.
(The graph shows feedbacks from 9 LDCs under UNCTAD's eTrade Readiness Assessment.)




Source: UNCTAD

Box 6.10. Correlation between TFA implementation and B2C internet use rating per region

A correlation is present between the implementation of TFA measures[33] relevant to e-commerce and the Business to Consumer (B2C) internet use[34] within the countries.

As illustrated in Figure 6.17, countries with higher Business to Consumer (B2C) internet usage tend to report higher WTO TFA implementation of e-commerce measures[35] notified as category A commitments. High use of the internet by businesses and consumers makes it easier to implement trade facilitation reforms that benefit such transactions.

Figure 6.17. Correlation between B2C Internet use and TFA Implementation (E-commerce Measures)




The earlier a country has notified TFA implementation, the higher the B2C Internet usage rating. Countries that notified the implementation of Trade facilitation measures in 2014 have an average B2C internet use of 4.54 while the index is only 3.44 for those countries that notified in 2018.

Looking at the data regionally, as illustrated in Figure 6.18., on average, almost all regions have implemented at least half of the TFA measures relevant to e-commerce. Africa has the lowest average implementation rate of TFA measures and has the lowest average B2C Internet use rating.

Further compliance with the TFA measures can support e-commerce trade when it builds a secure, transparent, and less costly environment to both businesses and consumers.

Box 6.10. Correlation between TFA implementation and B2C internet use rating per region

Figure 6.18. Average percent of implementation of TFA measures and B2C internet use rating per region



Source: UNCTAD

Further compliance with the TFA measures can support e-commerce trade when it builds a secure, transparent, and less costly environment to both businesses and consumers.

Source: UNCTAD

Notifications by WTO developing and LDC members indicate that demand for technical assistance support to implement the TFA provisions specific to e-commerce transactions is not particularly high. Just 25% of the developing and LDC WTO members have indicated a need for external support to implement the TFA provisions on express delivery which include the immediate release procedures, the *de minimis* waiver or exemption and other simplifications described above.[31] An "e-trade" readiness assessment may usefully assist the government and stakeholders validate the current situation, better understand the development potential and barriers to growth of its e-commerce market and, where appropriate, re-focus implementation priorities and revise technical support needs.

E-commerce transactions do present specific challenges for border agencies that are not present to the same degree as the traditional channel. The increased number of micro and small and medium businesses and consumers in the B2C e-commerce supply chain, about whom there is limited information, is a specific challenge for Customs risk assessment.[32] The national postal service, which typically operates in a manual, paper-based environment, is a border agency with which coordination and cooperation has heightened importance for e-commerce transactions. The information requirements and modes of information access of SME firms, which typically engage only occasionally in e-commerce cross-border trade, are not the same as those of firms which are regularly involved in traditional import or export transactions.

Nevertheless, the general foundations upon which these specific challenges can be addressed are being established with TACB support. Thus, as indicated in Part II of this chapter, developing and LDC members are, with technical support, establishing or enhancing their customs and other border agency risk management systems and procedures and improving risk analysis technique, which will be essential to enable the immediate release of low risk goods. Improved coordination of controls and exchange of information among border agencies, progressing toward an electronic Single Window, likewise promote faster release of low-risk goods whether arriving via the e-commerce channel or otherwise. Implementation of trade information portals and publication of plain language guides to requirements - also a focus of early support – are particularly important to enable SMEs to comply with border agency requirements (with which they typically have much less experience than larger firms, and fewer resources to investigate) and to take advantage of release simplifications.

Data suggest that such improvements in the trade facilitation environment is a potential catalyst for e-commerce.

Going forward, what is required to better facilitate e-commerce transactions is to extend and focus the reforms now being undertaken in risk management, transparency, border coordination etc. to the specific challenges presented by the e-commerce transactions. As previously suggested, a "e-readiness" or similar assessment would be valuable as a starting point to identify gaps and support needs in that regard.

CONCLUSION

Considerable technical and capacity building support has been provided to bolster developing and LDC WTO members in their implementation of the TFA. How does this financing support implementation, what progress has been made, and what impacts have been registered?

The experience of the World Bank Group Trade Facilitation Support Program (TFSP) and the UNCTAD Trade Facilitation Program, both providers of trade-related assistance, as well as OECD's analytical work provides insights to these questions.

As detailed in this chapter, the focus of support has been determined by client demand and a sequencing logic suggested by the Agreement, whereby certain essential measures are prioritised to enable implementation of others. Priority has thus been generally given to establishment of National Trade Facilitation Committees, the national bodies required to oversee implementation; carrying out time release studies, which provide countries with a baseline to measure progress; and implementation of risk management policies and procedures, which are a precondition for simplified control and release processes. The form of support required for these measures is most commonly technical and analytical expertise, and has been largely directed to the executive authority and the Customs administration.

The current and future direction of aid is also indicated by the notifications made by WTO developing and LDC members under the TFA's special and differential treatment provisions. There is high demand from these countries for technical assistance in implementation of TFA measures on Single Window, risk management, time release studies and transparency measures. Forms of support most commonly requested in notifications include capacity building, legislative support, and ICT. This chapter suggests that these notifications reveal a particular concern for implementation capacity and resources of the technical border agencies which typically are not as progressed in the trade facilitation agenda as the customs administration.

An important element of support is the establishment of mechanisms to measure implementation progress and to assess impact. A TFA Alignment Tracking Tool was developed by the WB-TFSP to enable countries measure their progress towards a "full and effective" implementation of the individual measures of the agreement. Initial measurements using the tool suggest that aid for trade has had positive effects improving rates of alignment to the TFA in countries receiving WB-TFSP support.

OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators likewise show implementation of the TFA is well underway, although performance is varied across and within different income groups. Early improvements appear in areas such as automation and streamlining of procedures and engagement with the trade community; the biggest challenges to be faced concern cooperation among the national border authorities and with their cross- border counterparts.

Trade facilitation reforms are producing positive impacts. Evidence from country reports indicate reduction in physical inspections, elimination of unnecessary documents, and automation of manual processes through implementation of TFA measures. Results of initial periodic time release studies show reduction of clearance times. The World Bank general trade facilitation surveys also indicate that improvements are being made in reduction of time and cost in countries receiving support. OECD research highlights the positive impact of trade facilitation on the internationalisation of SMEs – a message also echoed by developing country responses to the joint OECD-WTO Monitoring and evaluation exercise. To better enable developing and LDC Members track and demonstrate progress and impact of reforms, this chapter suggests that continued support is needed for establishment of appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems and tools.

Finally, this chapter considered the specific question as to how aid for trade can support trade facilitation of goods sold in e-commerce, a market with enormous export potential for SME's, which constitute the largest portion of firms in most developing and least-developed countries.

The trade facilitation challenges arising out of cross-border trade in goods sold through e-commerce are generally the same as those sold in traditional channels. Much the same response is needed, including full and effective implementation of the TFA measures. However, given the nature of e-commerce transactions, there are certain TFA and other trade facilitation reforms that are of particular relevance to development of this market, including implementation of a facilitative *de minimis* exception; TFA simplified release procedures for air cargo shipments; TFA pre-arrival procedures; and closer border agency coordination, particularly between customs administration and the national postal service. This chapter suggests that to assist development of e-commerce markets, aid for trade might be usefully deployed to extend and focus the reforms now being undertaken in risk management, transparency, border coordination etc. to the specific challenges presented by e-commerce transactions.

NOTES

1. WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Facility (TFAF) database, https://www.tfadatabase.org/. Hereinafter "TFAF database." Information from TFAF database in this chapter is as of February 15, 2019.
2. TFAF database. Estimate is based on notifications made by WTO members pursuant to TFA Article 22.1. The estimate is likely understated as Article 22.1 notifications for 2017 and 2018 are not complete and the estimate does not account for support provided but not required to be notified (e.g. support provided by WTO developing country members).
3. WB-TFSP development partners are the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia (DFAT), Global Affairs Canada, the European Union, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs of Switzerland (SECO), the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom (DFID, UK aid), and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).
4. TFA Article 21(3)(b).
5. WTO members formally agreed to launch negotiations on trade facilitation in July 2004, on the basis of modalities contained in Annex D of the so-called "July package". International Organisations identified as having a role in the implementation of TF-related reforms and referred to in this Annex have subsequently been referred to as Annex D Organisations. These include the IMF, OECD, UNCTAD, and the WCO. World Trade Organization, Doha Work Programme, Annex D, WT/L/579 (August 2, 2004).
6. TFAF database. In these notifications, certain WTO countries designated part of a TFA provision under one category and part under a different category. For purposes of this discussion, a country is deemed to have notified an entire TFA provision under a particular category if the country classified that provision either in whole or in part under the category.
7. In this and other figures in this subsection, the percentage represents the number of requests (e.g. for Single Window support) in relation to total number of category C notifications for all measures.
8. The time periods for making this notification are different between developing and LDC members.

   "Developing Country Member Category C

   (c) Upon entry into force of this Agreement, each developing country Member shall notify the Committee of the provisions that it has designated in Category C and their corresponding indicative dates for implementation. For transparency purposes, notifications submitted shall include information on the assistance and support for capacity building that the Member requires in order to implement.

   Least-Developed Country Member Category C

   (c) For transparency purposes and to facilitate arrangements with donors, one year after entry into force of this Agreement, each least-developed country Member shall notify the Committee of the provisions it has designated in Category C, taking into account maximum flexibilities for least-developed country Members.

   (d) One year after the date stipulated in subparagraph (c) above, least-developed country Members shall notify information on assistance and support for capacity building that the Member requires in order to implement."
9. These notifications typically state that such information is "to be determined." All notifications of this type were submitted by LDC's. The time period under the agreement for LDC's to provide this information (see footnote 8) has not yet expired.
10. Note, however, that these 44 countries include just 2 LDC members, and therefore the technical assistance needs discussed herein may not fully reflect a LDC perspective

11. See Figure 6.2, above.
12. For implementation to remain manageable, four agencies are defined per country as a proxy for the whole of government: (1) Customs; (2) Plant Protection and Quarantine; (3) the Bureau of Standards; and (4) the agency responsible for health.
13. In design of the tool, the assumption was taken that the implementation objective is maximum economic benefit through facilitation rather than technical legal compliance with the agreement. Using the OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators (TFIs) to monitor country progress in implementing the TFA, the OECD estimates that the potential cost reduction from a "full" implementation of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement is 16.5% of total costs for low income countries, 17.4% for lower middle income countries, 14.6% for upper middle income countries; whereas in a less ambitious implementation, limited to compliance with mandatory provisions of the agreement, the potential reduction reaches 12.6% for low income, 13.7% for lower middle income, and 12.8% for upper middle income countries. OECD (2018), Trade Facilitation and the Global Economy, OECD Publishing, Paris.
14. According to TFAF database, the measures with the lowest implementation rate are-
    Art. 10.4 - Single window
    Art. 7.7 - Authorised operators
    Art. 5.3 - Test procedures
    Art. 3 - Advance rulings
    Art. 7.6 - Average release times
    Art. 8 - Border Agency Cooperation
    Art. 1.3 - Enquiry points
    Art. 1.2 - Information available through internet
    Art. 7.4 - Risk management
15. WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement Preamble
16. Accordingly, the agreement "encourages" countries "to measure and publish their average release time of goods periodically and in a consistent manner, using tools such as, inter alia, the Time Release Study of the World Customs Organization." Article 7.6, WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement (Establishment and Publication of Average Release Times).
17. Significant data gaps still exist on the exact nature of barriers that women face in undertaking cross-border trade and on the gendered impact of improved customs and border procedures. Filling these gaps is essential to optimise the design and implementation of effective policy reforms and program interventions that maximise the gains from trade for all. To this end, the WB-TFSP has initiated work to help fill some of the knowledge gaps through the collection of data in face-to-face surveys. The work is being piloted East Asia and the Pacific region.
18. OECD defines e-commerce as "the sale or purchase of goods or services, conducted over computer networks by methods specifically designed for the purpose of receiving or placing of orders. The goods or services are ordered by those methods, but the payment and the ultimate delivery of the goods or services do not have to be conducted online. An e-commerce transaction can be between enterprises, households, individuals, governments, and other public or private organisations." OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms https://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=4721
19. See, e.g. UNCTAD, *Information Economy Report 2015: Unlocking the Potential of E-commerce for Developing Countries* (2015); International Trade Centre, *Bringing SMEs onto the E-Commerce Highway* (2016); World Customs Organization, WCO Study Report on Cross-Border E-Commerce (March 2017). These comments also draw on an upcoming World Bank Group Note: Facilitation and Logistics for E-commerce (Ankur Huria, author).

20. According to surveys of cross-border e-commerce consumers, 61% of packages shipped are valued at less than 50 Euro and 84% weigh 2 kilograms or less. International Post Corporation, *Cross-Border E-Commerce Shopper Survey 2018* (January 2019).
21. eMarketer; Statista.
22. UNCTAD, Information Economy Report 2015 at 12.
23. DHL, The 21st Century Spice Trade : A Guide to the Cross-Border E-commerce Opportunity (2016).
24. UNCTAD, Information Economy Report 2015 at 6.
25. "8.2 Subject to paragraphs 8.1 and 8.3, Members shall:. . . (d) provide, to the extent possible, for a *de minimis* shipment value or dutiable amount for which customs duties and taxes will not be collected, aside from certain prescribed goods. Internal taxes, such as value added taxes and excise taxes, applied to imports consistently with Article III of the GATT 1994 are not subject to this provision.". TFA Article 7.8.
26. Global Express Association global survey (including 28 EU countries) of *de minimis* customs duty amounts, converted to U.S. dollar (https://global-express.org/index.php?id=14). The average *de minimis* amount of the countries surveyed is approximately USD 150.
27. "8.2 Subject to paragraphs 8.1 and 8.3, Members shall:

    (a) minimise the documentation required for the release of expedited shipments in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 10 and, to the extent possible, provide for release based on a single submission of information on certain shipments;

    (b) provide for expedited shipments to be released under normal circumstances as rapidly as possible after arrival, provided the information required for release has been submitted;

    (c) endeavour to apply the treatment in subparagraphs (a) and (b) to shipments of any weight or value recognising that a Member is permitted to require additional entry procedures, including declarations and supporting documentation and payment of duties and taxes, and to limit such treatment based on the type of good, provided the treatment is not limited to low value goods such as documents[.]"
28. World Customs Organization, Guidelines for the Immediate Release of Consignments by Customs Version III (June 2018).
29. These include proposed Joint WCO-UPU Guidelines on the exchange of electronic advance data (EAD) between Posts and Customs. According to the WCO, the guidelines are "aimed at providing policy and technical guidance to designated postal operators and Customs administrations on how to establish the exchange of EAD, as well as gain support within the respective organisations for the adoption of this development project on a priority. They should be published in June 2019, once approved by the WCO Council." http://www.wcoomd.org/en/media/newsroom/2018/november/wco-upu-contact-committee-endorses-joint-guidelines.aspx.
30. UNCTAD, B2C E-E-commerce Index 2017 (October 2017).
31. TFAF database. Fifty-nine (60%) developing or LDC WTO members have classified TFA Article 7.8 (expedited delivery) under category A, indicating that the measure is fully implemented.
32. WCO Study Report on Cross-Border E-Commerce
33. The data show the measures notified by WTO Members under category A, assuming that they have implemented them.
34. NRI World Economic Forum data.
35. For all analysis done, the TFA measures relevant to e-commerce used are Article 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.6, 7.8, 8, 10.1, and 10.4.

REFERENCES

OECD (2018), Trade Facilitation and the Global Economy, OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2019a), "Helping SMEs internationalise through trade facilitation".

OECD (2019b), "Participation and benefits of SMES in GVCs in Southeast Asia".

CHAPTER 7

EXPORT DIVERSIFICATION AT THE TIME OF SLOWBALISATION


Contributed by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development

Abstract: *Export diversification remains an important development objective of many commodity-dependent developing countries. Today's global economic trends, however, suggest that the world may be entering a period of "slowbalisation", signified by slower growth of trade, foreign direct investment and capital flows. Growing environmental concerns also raise questions over the viability of repeating the pattern of massive export growth enjoyed by some developing countries in the past several decades. Shifting patterns of economic growth call for a new focus in developing countries' export diversification strategies. This chapter discusses that two areas - services trade and South-South trade – can provide developing countries with untapped potential for continuing export diversification. The chapter then discusses how South-South regional regulatory cooperation could enhance services trade and reduce the trade-distorting impact of non-tariff measures. To conclude, the chapter explores the role of Aid for Trade in enhancing export diversification through regional cooperation.*

EXPORT DIVERSIFICATION STRATEGIES – THEN AND NOW

Export diversification is part of a dynamic process of economic growth and economic diversification. To many commodity-dependent countries, expanding the content of their export basket with more manufactured products or services is a sign of value addition and successful structural transformation. Between 1995 and 2017, developing countries' exports of manufacturing products increased from 65% to 74% of total exports.


Figure 7.1. Share of Manufacturing in exports, 1995-2017



Source: UNCTAD Intrastat.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953679

Figure 7.2. Herfindahl Hirschman index of product concentration of exports, 1995-2017



Source: UNCTAD Intrastat.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953698


However, this increase mostly reflected the growth acceleration and structural transformation of a handful of emerging economies in Asia, particularly China (Figure 7.1). In 2017, Asia accounted for 88% of the manufacturing exports from developing countries, and for 94% of "South-South" manufacturing exports, where East Asia alone accounted for 65 and 69% respectively. In contrast, African exports became more concentrated, rather than more diversified, particularly in the years of the commodities super cycle (2000-2008), which was largely driven by China's increased demand for primary products (Figure 7.2).

Export concentration in a few primary commodities makes a country more vulnerable to external shocks and can negatively influence job opportunities in the exporting countries. A strong link can exist between the poor state of export diversification and the dismal nature of employment creation (UNCTAD, 2018a). For example, Africa's weak diversification is a major factor behind unemployment in the region. Africa has the youngest population structure in the world. It is estimated that of the 420 million African youth (i.e. aged between 15 and 35 years), about 31% are unemployed, and over 70 percent are underemployed (Betcherman and Khan 2015). The African Development Bank projects that 18 million jobs need to be created annually between 2015 and 2035 in order to absorb youth entering the labour market for the first time (African Development Bank, 2016).

Export diversification thus remains an important developmental objective of developing countries, particularly in Africa with predominantly commodity dependent countries. In recent years, many developing countries placed measures to increase their participation in global value chains (GVCs), often through export processing zone (EPZ) schemes, at the core of their export diversification strategies. This was a logical choice particularly in the years between 1995 and 2008 when GVCs proliferated and there was a rapid expansion of trade in intermediate goods.

Today's global economic trends, however, suggest that the world may be entering a period of "slowbalisation" characterised by slower growth, or contraction, of trade, foreign direct investment (FDI) and capital flows.[1] Since the latter part of 2018, international organisations have repeatedly adjusted their global economic prospect downwards.[2] The World Bank reported in its monthly highlight of March 2019 that global merchandise trade has lost the growth momentum of 2017. The year-on-year growth of the volume of container shipping was 5% in February 2018 but fell to 2% in February 2019. Likewise, the annual growth of new export orders turned negative in February 2019.[3] As regards FDI flows, the total value fell by almost 20%, from USD1.47 trillion in 2017 to an estimated USD1.2 trillion in 2018, a level equivalent to the value of FDI just after the global financial crisis in 2009 (UNCTAD, 2019a).

Figure 7.3. GVC Participation Growth rate (%), 2000-2010 and 2010-2017



Source: World Investment Report 2018 (UNCTAD, 2018c).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953717

The sluggishness in trade and FDI are closely related to the deceleration of GVCs (Constantinescu et al., 2018). The growth of GVCs has come to a halt. The share of foreign value added (FVA), i.e. the value of imported goods and services incorporated in exports, declined from 31% in 2010 to 30% of world exports in 2017 (UNCTAD, 2018c). The growth in developing countries' participation in GVCs has slowed down considerably in the past decade (Figure 7.3).[4] In the first decade of the 21st century, developing countries increased their participation in GVCs on average by 13% annually. In the years between 2010 and 2017, this has come down to 3%. The fall in GVC participation growth was particularly significant in Africa and in LDCs. Heightened uncertainty over a potential trade war between the US and China may further exacerbate these trends. UNCTAD estimates that the high volume of Chinese exports affected by US tariffs is likely to contract East Asian value chains by about USD160 billion.[5]

The prospect of rapid trade growth in coming years is seemingly low, not only because of growing uncertainty over a trade war but also because the significant trade liberalisation in tariffs that the world experienced in the post-Uruguay Round years seems to have come to an end point. The simple average of world most-favoured nation (MFN) tariffs on manufacturing products in 2017 was only marginally lower than the level 10 years ago, while there was absolutely no change when measured as a trade-weighted average. The same pattern applies to the average of preferential tariffs, i.e. those set under preferential trade agreements including bilateral and regional trade agreements (RTAs) (UNCTAD, 2019c).

Growing environmental concerns also raise questions over the viability of economic policy that focuses on repeating the explosive exports growth – in primary commodities, agriculture or manufacturing – that some developing countries experienced in the past several decades. Unchecked globalisation in past decades has radically reshaped the environmental conditions that are faced today, which include climate change and "the sixth extinction" in terms of losing biodiversity, among others. In 2012, it was suggested that if the world's 7 billion citizens consumed as much as the average US citizen, 4 Earths would be needed to sustain consumption.[6]

In December 2018, the member states of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreed at the 24th Conference of the Parties (COP24) on a "rulebook" for implementing the Paris Agreement, i.e. to keep global temperature rise in this century to below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels by significantly reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. International trade is considered one of the major drivers of GHG emissions because of the need to transport goods by land, sea, or air (with transport still mostly dependent on fossil energy), and the fact that it provides economic incentives for large-scale agricultural and industrial production. On the other hand, through international trade, countries export goods and services produced based on their comparative or competitive advantage and buy those that they do not produce, which results in an efficient reallocation of resources across sectors.

In the current sustainable development paradigm, elaborated by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), trade and export diversification strategies should be designed as an integral element of a broader sustainable development policy. This suggests that developing countries, particularly commodity dependent countries, African countries and LDCs, may need to shift the focus of their export diversification strategies away from GVC participation to other strategies that could help them achieve trade and economic growth not only quantitatively, but also structurally, in a manner that is environmentally sustainable and inclusive to all groups of people.[7]


The following section discusses the viability of services trade and South-South intraregional trade as two areas that are likely to provide continuing if not greater market opportunities for export diversification and sustainable development.

SERVICES TRADE AND SOUTH-SOUTH INTERREGIONAL TRADE

Services trade

The services sector has emerged as the largest segment of most national economies, contributing a growing share to GDP, trade and employment, and becoming a major driving force of the world economy. Trade in services presents continued growth potential even in light of the global economic slowdown. UNCTAD and WTO estimated that world trade in services achieved an annual growth of 8% in 2018 (compared to 3% for the volume of world merchandise trade), to reach almost USD 6 trillion (USD 19.5 trillion for the value of merchandise trade) (Figure 7.4).[8] Several developing countries have gained substantial benefits by exploiting trading opportunities in services, including modern exportable business services and temporary movement of natural persons that provide services. Lower-income developing countries, however, are yet to acquire the critical capacity to follow suit, relying heavily on traditional, non-tradable and low-productivity services, including the informal economy (UNCTAD, 2018f).

Figure 7.4. Services exports by main groups of economies, 2010-2018



Source: UNCTADStats.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953736

The services sector has become the largest provider of jobs in many developing countries, as manufacturing value chains are outsourced to services suppliers and as the final consumer demand for services increases with rising income levels. Today, the services sector absorbs almost half of the employment worldwide. In all developing regions the share of services employment has increased during the last decade. But the contribution of the services sector to employment varies significantly among different developing regions (Figure 7.5).

With more than 60% of total employment, the services sector is particularly important for Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC). In Africa, the services sector gradually increased its absorption of employment, but it is still at a lower level than in other developing regions. This is indicative of the small share that services claim in the overall economy in Africa.[9] An UNCTAD study confirms that the impact of services trade on jobs in services has the potential to create a higher number of jobs in absolute terms than trade in the manufacturing sector (Box 7. 1).

Box 7.1. Trade in services and employment

In 2018, UNCTAD conducted the study "Trade in Services and Employment" (UNCTAD, 2018f) which looked into the employment potential of trade in services.

The study confirms that the overall impact of services trade on jobs is weaker than that of trade in goods. But this is influenced by the fact that the services sector in many developing countries remains relatively small.


When the smaller share of the services sector in international trade vis-à-vis the manufacturing sector is taken into account, services have the potential to create a higher number of jobs in absolute terms than the manufacturing sector. The study estimates that USD 1 billion extra value added exports of the services sector would create 112,000 new jobs in Mexico, while the same amount in the manufacturing sector would only generate 36,000 new jobs. Similarly, a 1 per cent increase in services exports increases employment in the sector by 42,000 jobs, while the same increase in manufactures creates about 32,000 jobs.

The result, however, is not uniform across the other sample country cases used in the study. While the results for the United Kingdom, France, Brazil, Japan, and Germany, and the United States are similar to the Mexican case, different outcomes are observed for Turkey, India and China. In the latter group of countries, even the absolute effect of export growth is bigger for manufactures than for the services sector. The difference between these two groups of countries is linked to the share of services in total employment. This suggests that countries in Africa would experience a similar impact as the latter group.

These findings suggest that, from the perspective of job creation, diversification into services exports should be complementary to and not a replacement of export diversification in goods as long as the services sector claims a small share in a country's economy. Additionally, some services sectors require an abundance of highly skilled labour, and are unlikely to absorb unskilled labour at a large scale, which means that diversification in that case may not lead to inclusive growth in trade.

It is also important to note that the services sector tends to attract proportionally more female workers than male workers. An expansion of the services sector would thus improve job opportunities for female workers, but its developmental impact should be considered with caution. Creation of new jobs through trade opening, for instance, has at times had a negative relationship with the gender wage gap, as female workers tend to concentrate in lower-wage segments that are stimulated by increased trade (see UNCTAD Trade, Gender and Development Program).


Figure 7.5. Employment in the services sector (% of total), 2000, 2010 and 2018



Source: ILOStats.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953755

Figure 7.6. Services Trade Restrictions Index by sector, regional averages



Note: this figure compares the restrictiveness of services trade policy across regions based on simple averages across countries of the World Bank Services Trade Restrictions Index, which ranges from 0 to 100. The World Bank Services Trade Restrictions Database covers 103 countries (79 developing) and financial, basic telecommunications, transport, distribution and selected professional services. The information for the database was collected between 2008 and 2010.

Source: World Bank Services Trade Restrictions Database.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953774

Services trade has the potential to contribute to export diversification through two different channels: the role of services as exports, and their role as embedded inputs to economic activities. As exports, services trade can directly contribute to vertical export diversification, by shifting exports away from primary products. In this way, countries would be able to diversify their exports without going through an industrialisation phase (Ghani and O'Connell 2014). The tradability of services is also increasing with the advancement of information and communication technology (ICT) (Ghani and Kharas 2010) as innovations in ICT continue to decrease the costs associated with services trade (Ghani and O'Connell 2014). Initially the progress in ICT only influenced the financial services (e.g. via online transactions), but it now contributes to development of trade in a variety of services, including education and health services.[10]

In their role as embedded inputs, services are vital not only as linkages between different steps in value chains, such as transportation services, but also as direct inputs in the production of goods (e.g. research, financial services, etc). The increasing "servicification" of manufacturing, i.e. increased reliance of the manufacturing sector on services, in past decades has made the role of services as embedded inputs all the more relevant.[11] Services reform that facilitated access to competitive services inputs has increased the productivity and the competitiveness of the manufacturing sector, for example in the cases of India, (Arnold et al. 2016), and Chile (Fernandes and Paunov 2012).

To further enhance services trade, trade policy matters. This is because services trade still faces substantial policy barriers, though at varying degrees across countries and sectors. According to the Services Trade Restrictions Index, some fast-growing developing countries in Asia have some of the most restrictive services trade policies, while other developing countries are very open. Trade in professional and transportation services has remained restricted across the board, while financial and retail services are usually more open (Figure 7.6). Additionally, restrictiveness can vary considerably by mode across countries and sectors, which further complicates trade in services (Borchert, Gootiiz, and Mattoo 2012).[12]


South-South Intraregional Trade

The second area that can nurture export diversification of developing countries in the coming years is South-South intraregional trade. Developing countries have already been exporting more diverse products, including processed products, to neighbouring countries than to their traditional developed-country trade partners.

Figure 7.7 provides a detailed picture of the changes in the composition of exports experienced by different developing country groups in the years between 1995-2017. Exported products are grouped into five categories: high-technology, medium technology, resource-based and low technology, primary products and other, using the definition provided by Lall (Lall, 2000).[13] The right side axis reflects the share of exports to each respective market. In the years since 1995, Africa's exports to the South have increased significantly, from just over 20% of the total in 1995 to almost 50% in 2017. Africa's exports to the South include more low- and medium-technology products than their exports to the North, but the main component remains primary products. This may be influenced by the high concentration in the primary sector of Africa's exports to China, which accounts for around 10% of Africa's total exports.

Looking at intra-Africa trade, the breakdown of traded products is very different from the above. Intraregional trade as a share of total exports has been gradually but steadily increasing in Africa and reached 20% in 2017. It is also more diversified and contains much greater shares of low- and high-technology based products. Figure 7.8 provides the changes in the share of medium and high technology products in Africa's total exports in the years 2005, 2010 and 2017, grouped according to the destination. The share of medium and high technology exports to the world increased from 9% in 2005 to 15% in 2017. But medium and high technology exports claimed almost a quarter of Africa's intraregional trade in 2017, having increased by over 7 percentage point since 2005. This trend, i.e. a higher degree of export diversification in intraregional trade, is consistent across different developing regions throughout the years. Intraregional trade appears to encourage intra-industry export diversification, and exports with higher technology content than exports to the world, as confirmed for the case of East Africa in (Na, 2019).


Figure 7.7. Exports by technological category and partner, selected regions, 1995-2017



Source: UN COMTRADE. Note: East, South and South East Asia excludes China. Product categories are based on the classification developed by Lall (Lall, 2000).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953793

Figure 7.8. Share of medium and high technology goods in African exports by destination



Source: UNCTADStat. Key Statistics and Trends in Regional Trade in Africa (UNCTAD, 2019b).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953812

Greater export diversification in South-South intraregional trade has happened despite the fact that market access conditions or trade facilitation within intraregional trade are not always favourable to trade. ESCAP, for example, estimates that the intraregional trade potential in South Asia is around USD 81 billion, of which only a third is realised due to the high cost of trade, among other barriers.[14] There appears to be significant space for further reduction in trade costs in South-South regional settings (WTO, 2018b).

As regards market access conditions, a significant impact upon trade costs increase is generated by technical regulatory measures applied by importing countries, such as technical barriers to trade (TBT) and sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures. TBT and SPS measures are domestic technical measures with legitimate policy objectives such as protection of human and animal health, safety and environment. TBT and SPS measures stem from policy objectives that are not related to trade, but because of their significant impact upon trade flows, such technical measures can constitute non-tariff measures (NTMs) that increase trade costs via, *inter alia*, high cost of compliance (e.g. laboratory testing and certification).

Various studies have found that NTMs have a greater impact upon trade cost increase than tariffs.[15] The trade-distorting impact of NTMs can be measured by estimating the *ad valorem* equivalent (AVE) of the cost of meeting NTMs, i.e. as a percent of an import price. A study finds that NTMs applied in the food and agriculture sectors in Africa could raise unit values of products traded intra-regionally by 15-30% compared to the average intraregional tariff in the same sector of around 7% (UNCTAD, 2019b). The average AVE of NTMs in the manufacturing sector is estimated to be around 5% to 20%, compared to the average intra-Africa tariff of 5.4%.[16]

Technical measures tend to be costlier and more burdensome for smaller producers and businesses than for bigger firms. According to the International Trade Centre (ITC), small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in developing countries are disproportionally affected by procedural obstacles and NTMs, as they often lack the appropriate resources to deal with these barriers (Rollo, 2016).

SOUTH-SOUTH REGIONAL REGULATORY COOPERATION

Services restrictions, technical NTMs and, more generally, regulatory differences between countries can prevent economies of scale in international markets for goods and services. For example, the costs attached to supplying professional services (e.g. licenses or degrees for accountants, doctors, etc.) must be paid separately in each market, instead of being spread out across destinations. However, neither services restrictions nor technical NTMs can be simply eliminated, as they are usually legitimate domestic measures serving a country's socio-economic and environmental objectives. Since economic, social and environmental standards that are unilaterally incorporated to a country's domestic regulation may inadvertently affect local and foreign producers, consumers and competition, there are gains to be made from regulatory convergence or regulatory cooperation.

Regional (and global) regulatory cooperation can boost trade in services and intraregional trade, reducing the risk of unintentional effects of regulation on local markets and trading partners. In this sense, regulatory cooperation can encourage export diversification by reducing transaction costs associated with services trade and intraregional trade.[17] Regulatory cooperation on services trade, for example promoting joint communication infrastructure and network development, can create a more facilitative policy environment.

Developing regions already have multiple regional trade agreements (RTAs) in place, many of which include some provisions on services trade restrictions and technical NTMs. Existing RTAs and emerging ones such as the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) can provide a platform for further regulatory cooperation, which in turn can improve regional market access conditions, and with them increased likelihood for export diversification.[18] Regulatory and institutional frameworks that are best fit to local conditions and priorities are critical for a good functioning of services sectors, particularly infrastructure services, as their performance is highly dependent on the quality of regulations.

Regulatory cooperation beyond existing RTA provisions can take the form of mutual recognition of regulatory measures or harmonisation, among others. Regulatory cooperation takes different forms depending on a number of factors: existing regulation, financial and technical resources, the countries' priorities in the trade-off between social goals and competition in services, and the services or goods sector in question. For instance, cooperation in financial services is more likely to take the form of harmonisation efforts of prudential regulation, perhaps through the adoption of international standards such as Basel III, whereas for professional services mutual recognition may be more suitable. In the case of goods, evidence shows that mutual recognition agreements (MRAs) for technical NTMs have a larger positive effect on trade for technology intensive industries (Jang, 2018).[19]

Multiple efforts in the direction of mutual recognition and harmonisation of regional regulation are underway. For example, between 2003 and 2014 countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) signed Mutual Recognition Arrangements (MRAs) for tourism, accountancy, architecture, dentistry, engineering, medicine and nursing. Although it is too early to determine the effect of these MRAs on trade with any certainty, they have already led to a capacity building effort in member States to upgrade national regulation and training standards (Mendoza et al, 2016). In the case of NTMs on goods, a number of Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) projects that seek to use Good Regulatory Practices (GRPs) in the development or review of SPS measures have encouraged regional convergence in regulation. For example, the Regional Feed and Food Safety Programme sought to advance regulatory harmonisation with regard to trade in animal feed in ten countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. To that effect, a number of specific tools were developed, such as common glossaries and comparative analyses of national and regional regulation, among other activities, such as capacity building.[20]

In cases where mutual recognition or harmonisation of regional regulation is too challenging, even increasing regulatory transparency among countries may already be an important step forward for regional regulatory cooperation. Some innovative approaches for increasing regulatory transparency have started in South-South RTAs, such as the African Regional Economic Communities (RECs) establishing the Tripartite Free Trade Area by bringing together three African RECs, namely the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), the East African Community (EAC) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC). Using the international classification of NTMs, developed by UNCTAD and the Multi-Agency Support Team (MAST), the Tripartite Free Trade Area has developed a web-based reporting mechanism (www.tradebarriers.org) that enables the private sector to directly report NTBs or NTM-related trade obstacles they face when exporting to member countries.[21]

The potential economic benefits from regional regulatory cooperation can be huge. An UNCTAD study on the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) suggests that regulatory cooperation on NTMs can reduce trade restrictions by more than 25%, which can result in an increase in intra-ECOWAS trade of 15% and total income of USD 300 million per year (UNCTAD, 2018d). Another study estimated that regulatory cooperation can increase welfare by USD 21 billion in the AfCFTA and by USD 23 billion in the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States. This is more than five times the possible gain from total tariff elimination (Vanzetti, Peters and Knebel, 2017).

Regional regulatory cooperation can also prompt other benefits, such as income and employment generation, cost-effective inputs and services within the region, and enhanced competitiveness due to higher competition within the region, made possible through deeper regional market integration. This can, in turn, enhance progress in African countries towards meeting the SDGs. The regional sphere is a particularly appropriate arena for incorporating environmental and social dimensions into trade policy. Developmental challenges such as income inequality, gender inequality, water scarcity, and environmental degradation, can be addressed more effectively and more efficiently via regional regulatory cooperation than attempted individually. This is why the Addis Ababa Action Agenda recognises "(..) the significant potential of regional economic integration and interconnectivity to promote inclusive growth and sustainable development and commit to strengthening regional cooperation and regional trade agreements".[22]

THE ROLE OF AID FOR TRADE

The regional regulatory cooperation, mutual recognition and harmonisation efforts described in the previous section can become the vehicle that leads to export diversification associated with the achievement of multiple SDGs. While these are, beyond any doubt, desirable outcomes, the deep integration process leading up to them is riddled with political complexity, as well as being time- and resource-intensive. Additionally, as pointed out in (OECD, 2014), for regional economic integration to materialise, trade-related infrastructure and processes need to be efficient.

As highlighted in (Lamersen, Muoio, & Roberts, 2019), the time, resources and preconditions required for a successful process of regional integration provide a rationale for aid for trade under a number of the themes in the initiative: improving trade-related infrastructure, facilitating trade, creating a trade-enabling environment and building productive capacities. This means that even though in the period 2006-2017 only between 11% and 19% of aid-for-trade disbursements were specifically dedicated to regional or global programs, many disbursements for national programs contributed to the necessary preconditions for regional integration.[23]

Although aid-for-trade programmes with a specific global or regional focus represent a small share of total aid-for-trade flows, the absolute amount of funds devoted to them increased threefold between 2006 and 2017, from USD 2.2 to USD 6.6 billion.[24] These funds have mostly been devoted to building productive capacity (60-80%) and economic infrastructure (12-29%).

Funds aimed at supporting regional regulatory cooperation, mutual recognition and harmonisation efforts would most likely be classified under global or regional funds destined for trade policy and regulation. This aid-for-trade category increased from 248 million in 2006 to 565 million in 2017 but has remained fairly stable since 2011. In particular, the RTAs item of this category (CRS code 33130), which contains work on TBT and SPS measures at a regional level, ranged between 49 and 125 million since 2006. Even if the entire RTA category was dedicated to regional work on technical NTMs, the funds assigned to that purpose would seem low, considering the potential economic benefits from regional regulatory cooperation.[25]

There are a number of reasons why most aid-for-trade funds remain destined for the national level despite the large potential benefits of some regional programmes, as explained in detail in (Lamersen, Muoio, & Roberts, 2019). In some cases, regional externalities may be hard to appropriate, leading to the oversight of potential beneficial programmes. Additionally, a number of characteristics of regional programmes makes their implementation more challenging. Countries at different levels of development and with different political environments will find additional difficulties in coordinating regional implementations. Similarly, differences in the real or perceived costs and benefits of implementation for each country can lead to complications in the implementation of a regional agenda. Moreover, countries are usually involved in multiple integration processes simultaneously, making alignment of national and regional actions more difficult. Also, it is commonly the case that the coordination of multiple donors, the private sector and civil society are required for a successful implementation of a regional program.

It is also important to highlight that partner countries responding to the 2017 Aid for Trade Monitoring and evaluation exercise consistently stated export diversification and regional integration among their top aid-for-trade priorities.[26] The priorities of partner countries, together with the potential benefits of regional regulatory integration suggest that this needs to be a priority area despite its implementation challenges. There is a continued role for aid for trade in supporting efforts to develop institutional mechanisms and capacity building that facilitate local coordination of regional programmes.

NOTES

1. Even though it was first coined by Adjiedj Bakas, a Dutch trend-watcher, in 2015, the term "slowbalisation" has only been increasingly used since its recent appearance in The Economist, "Globalisation has faltered", January 24th 2019. But the underlying trends in trade and FDI that this term describes have long been studied as detailed below.
2. The *World Economic Situation and Prospects 2019* estimates that global economic activity will expand by 3 per cent in 2019 but considers that growth may have peaked amid escalating trade disputes, risks of financial stress and volatility, and an undercurrent of geopolitical tensions (UN, 2019).
3. The World Bank Group, Global Monthly, March 2019.
4. GVC participation is defined as in (Koopman et al., 2014).
5. UNCTAD Press Release, *Trade Wars: The Pain and the Gain*, 4 February 2019.
6. Tim De Chante, "If the world population lived like…", August 8, 2012. De Chante used a subset of the data produced by the Global Footprint Network (GFN).
7. Paragraph 9, *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.
8. UNCTAD, Trade in Services, 2018: First Annual Estimate, 2 April 2019.
9. In Africa, agriculture still accounts for a significant share – around 58 per cent – of total employment.
10. For example, specific telemedicine services enabled by broadband technology are increasingly used in Afghanistan (Rocha 2017).
11. We follow here the definition of "servicification" used in (Miroudot 2017), which refers to the increased reliance of the manufacturing sector on services, whether embedded as inputs or bundled with outputs.
12. Services trade is defined by mode of supply: mode 1 corresponds to cross-border supply, mode 2 to consumption abroad, mode 3 to commercial presence and mode 4 to presence of natural persons.
13. Exported products are classified according to the 3-digit SITC, revision 2 classification. See Lall (2000) for more details on the classification of exports according to technological content.
14. ESCAP (2018), Press Release, "Regional Cooperation Critical for Sustainable Trade", 16 October 2018.
15. For instance, see Kee, Nicita and Olarreaga (2008).
16. Cadot et al (2015) estimated that the average AVE of all NTMs existing in the animal and vegetable sectors is in the range of 26-27 per cent. That is, complying with NTMs imposed by importing countries when exporting animal or vegetable products would cost on average around 26-27 per cent of the product price. This is significantly higher than the average tariff barrier in the same sector, which is in the range of 7-8 per cent.
17. Regulatory cooperation is in fact an important component of trade facilitation. Improved trade facilitation is associated with an expansion in the range of products exported (Dennis and Shepherd, 2011; Beverelli et al., 2015).
18. Research on preferential trade agreements (PTAs) suggests that regulatory cooperation can benefit small firms in terms of market gains relatively more than large firms (Baccini, Pinto, and Weymouth, 2017). Additionally, a growing number of PTAs incorporate provisions explicitly mentioning MSMEs, either promoting cooperation on MSMEs or exempting them from PTA obligations (WTO, 2016). With regards to women empowerment, new PTAs increasingly contain explicit gender considerations, generally included in labour provisions. Evidence shows that agreements with labour provisions contribute to narrowing the gender gap in participation in the workforce, and at least for some countries, the gender gap in wages as well (ILO, 2017).

19. Interestingly, the effect is also larger for trade between non-OECD countries.
20. http://www.feedfoodseguro.org/el-proyecto
21. The MAST group is composed of the following international organisations: Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), International Trade Centre (ITC), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), World Bank, and World Trade Organization.
22. Paragraph 87 of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (July 2015).
23. The lion's share of bilateral aid-for-trade funds targeted economic infrastructure and building productive capacities, with 51-62 and 36-47 per cent of total disbursements each between 2005 and 2017.
24. These values are expressed in 2017 prices.
25. The examples to that effect mentioned earlier are an additional USD300 million per year of trade in ECOWAS (UNCTAD, 2018d), and a USD 23 billion increase in welfare in the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States (Vanzetti, Peters and Knebel, 2017).
26. When asked to list their top 5 aid-for-trade priorities, 65 out of 86 respondents included export diversification, and 35 also mentioned regional integration (the first and fourth most frequently listed priorities respectively).

REFERENCES

African Development Bank (2016), *Jobs for Youth in Africa: Strategy for Creating 25 Million Jobs and Equipping 50 Million Youth 2016-2025.* African Development Bank, Abidjan.

Arnold, J. M., Javorcik, B., Lipscomb, M. and A. Mattoo (2016). 'Services Reform and Manufacturing Performance: Evidence from India'. *The Economic Journal,* 126 (590): 1–39.

Baccini, L., Pinto, P. M., and S. Weymouth (2017). 'The distributional consequences of preferential trade liberalization: firm-level evidence', *International Organization*, 71(2), 373–395.

Betcherman, G. and Khan, T (2015), Youth Employment in Sub-Sahara Africa.

Beverelli C., Neumueller, S. and R. Teh (2015). 'Export diversification effects of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement'. *World Development*, 76(C):293–310.

Borchert, I., Gootiiz, B. and A. Mattoo (2012). 'Policy Barriers to International Trade in Services: Evidence from a New Database'. *Policy Research Working Paper,* No. 6109. World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Cadot, O., Asprilla, A., Gourdon, J., Knebel, C. and R. Peters (2015). 'Deep Regional Integration and Non-Tariff Measures: A Methodology for Data Analysis'. UNCTAD/ITCD/TAB/71, UNCTAD, Geneva.

Constantinescu, C., Mattoo, A., and M. Ruta (2018). 'The Global Trade Slowdown: Cyclical or Structural?'. *The World Bank Economic Review,* lhx027, https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhx027.

Dennis, A. and B. Shepherd (2011). 'Trade facilitation and export diversification'. *The World Economy*, 34(1):101–122.

ESCAP (2018). 'Policy development and potential impacts of trade tensions in Asia and the Pacific', in *Asia-Pacific Trade and Investment Report 2018: Recent trends and developments*, ESCAP, Bangkok.

Fernandes, A.M., and C. Paunov (2012). 'Foreign Direct Investment in Services and Manufacturing Productivity: Evidence for Chile'. *Journal of Development Economics* 97 (2): 305–321.

Ghani, E. and H. Kharas (2010). 'The Service Revolution'. *Economic Premise*, No. 14. World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Ghani, E. and S. D. O'Connell (2014). 'Can Service Be a Growth Escalator in Low-Income Countries?' *Policy Research Working Paper*, No. 6971. World Bank, Washington, D.C.

ILO (2017). *Handbook on Assessment of Labour Provisions in Trade and Investment Arrangements*. International Labour Organization, Geneva.

Jang, Y. J. (2018). 'How do mutual recognition agreements influence trade?'. *Review of Development Economics,* 22(3), e95-e114.

Kee, H.L., Nicita, A. and M. Olarreaga (2008). 'Estimating trade restrictiveness indices'. *The Economic Journa*l 119.534 (2008): 172-199.

Lall, S. (2000). 'The Technological Structure and Performance of Developing Country Manufactured Exports, 1985-1998'. *QEH Working Paper Series*, No. 44, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, Oxford.

Lamersen, F., Muoio, R., and Roberts, M. (2019). 'Regional Aid for Trade in Africa: a catalyst for economic integration and development' in Luke, D. and J. Macleod (Eds.) (2019). *Inclusive Trade in Africa*. Routledge, New York, 2019.

Mendoza, D. R., Desiderio, M. V., Sugiyarto, G., and B. Salant (2016). *Open Windows, Closed Doors: Mutual Recognition Arrangements on Professional Services in the ASEAN Region*. Asian Development Bank, Manila, Philippines.

Miroudot, S. (2017). 'The Servicification of Global Value Chains', Multi-year Expert Meeting on Trade, Services and Development, UNCTAD, Geneva.

Na, H. (2019). 'Is intraregional trade an opportunity for industrial upgrading in East Africa? '. *Oxford Development Studies*, 1-15.

OECD (2014). *Regional Perspectives on Aid for Trade.* OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD (2018). 'International Regulatory Cooperation', Policy Brief, October 2018.

OECD/WTO (2017). *Aid for Trade at a Glance 2017: Promoting Trade, Inclusiveness and Connectivity for Sustainable Development*. WTO, Geneva/OECD Publishing, Paris.

Rocha, Nadia (2017). 'Trade as a Vehicle for Growth in Afghanistan: Challenges and Opportunities'. *Working Paper.* World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Rollo, V. (2016). 'Technical regulations affect exporters' performance: firm-level evidence from developing countries'. *ITC Working Paper Series*, WP-02-2016.E. International Trade Centre, Geneva.

UN (2015). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015 (A/RES/70/1), United Nations, New York.

UN (2019). *World Economic Situation and Prospects 2019.* United Nations, New York.

UNCTAD (2018a). *Export Diversification and Employment in Africa.* (UNCTAD/ALDC/2018/3), UNCATD, Geneva.

UNCTAD (2018c). *World Investment Report 2018*. UNCTAD, Geneva.

UNCTAD (2018d). 'Regional Integration and Non-Tariff Measures in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)'. (UNCTAD/DITC/TAB/2018/1), UNCTAD, Geneva.

UNCTAD (2018e). *Trade and Development Report 2018: Power, PLatforms and the Free Trade Delusion.* (UNCTAD/TDR/2018), UNCTAD, Geneva.

UNCTAD (2018f). 'Trade in Services and Employment'. (UNCTAD/DITC/TNCD/2018/1), Geneva.

UNCTAD (2019a). Global Investment Trends Monitor, Issue 31, January 2019, Geneva.

UNCTAD (2019b). 'Key Statistics and Trends in Regional Trade in Africa'. (UNCTAD/DITC/TAB/2019/3), UNCTAD, Geneva.

UNCTAD (2019c). *Key Statistics and Trends in Trade Policy 2018: Trade Tensions, Implications for Developing Countries.* (UNCTAD/DITC/TAB/2019/1), UNCTAD, Geneva.

Vanzetti, D., Peters, R. and C. Knebel (2017). 'Non-tariff measures: lifting CFTA and ACP trade to the next level'. (UNCTAD/SER.RP/2017/14), Geneva.

WTO (2016). *World Trade Report 2016: Levelling the trading field for SMEs*. World Trade Organization, Geneva.

WTO (2018a). Annual Overview Report of the Director-General on trade-related developments (WT/TPR/OV/21), December 2018, Geneva.

WTO (2018b). *World Trade Statistical Review 2018*. World Trade Organization, Geneva.

World Bank, Global Economic Prospects: Darkening Skies, January 2019, Washington DC.

CHAPTER 8

EMPOWERING YOUTH FOR SUSTAINABLE TRADE

Contributed by the International Trade Centre

Abstract: *Youth economic empowerment is tied to the future of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). This chapter looks at the role of internationally competitive SMEs in providing jobs for young people and examines how improved youth skills and innovation promote the export capacity of SMEs. Firm-level data show that access to finance is more of a challenge for youth-led firms than firms with older leaders. The chapter finds that Aid for Trade programmes which improve access to financial services for youth entrepreneurs, and improve the skills of young people, promote SME competitiveness for trade while helping young people find gainful employment.*

INTRODUCTION

The question of whether and how trade contributes to inclusive growth remains high on the policy agenda. Decades of trade liberalisation have helped reduce poverty, but have been accompanied in many countries by a growing gap between rich and poor (Draper, 2017; OECD, 2015; Winters and Martuscelli, 2014). Although economies are increasingly interconnected, world trade growth appears to be stagnating (WTO, 2019).

This has led some people to question the ability of trade to deliver benefits for all. Policies that boost the participation of women, youth and other marginalised groups in global commerce can make trade more inclusive and promote economic empowerment.

A focus on youth in trade is particularly relevant today, given that young people account for a large and growing proportion of the population in many developing countries. There are 1.2 billion youth aged 15–24 years around the world (UNESA, 2015), yet 66 million young men and women are jobless and 145 million are working, but poor (ITC, 2019a). Youth are three times as likely as adults to be unemployed (ILO, 2017), and this can lead to migration pressures.

At the same time, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) struggle to find the skilled employees they need to be competitive and to trade. Although SMEs account for more than a third of gross domestic product (GDP) in developing countries, skill shortages restrict their capacity to change, compete and connect to key markets.

The twin problems of youth unemployment and SME competitiveness can and should be solved jointly. Youth economic empowerment is an objective in and of itself: indeed, Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 urges the international community to provide 'full and productive employment and decent work' for young people.

Youth feel empowered economically when they have well-paid, interesting jobs. This is more likely to happen when companies are competitive and hire young people. With SMEs accounting for most jobs in developing countries, they are well placed to hire local youth and provide on-the-job training and experience that can be a gateway to a career. In fact, SDG 8 stresses that SME growth is vital to sustainable development. But to grow and be able to hire in today's globalised economy, small enterprises must boost their competitiveness and attractiveness to youth as a viable career option.

In this chapter, we examine the connections between youth economic empowerment and the international competitiveness of small companies. We find that the objectives of youth economic empowerment and SME competitiveness are synergistic – that is, the relationship goes both ways. Improved youth skills and innovation promote SME competitiveness and exports, while internationally competitive SMEs provide more and better jobs for young people. We also assess the characteristics of youth economic empowerment programmes that are essential in helping young people to find gainful employment in small firms, as workers or entrepreneurs.

YOUTH SKILLS FOR EXPORT READY COMPANIES


Education and skills are important to youth development, and they influence economic and social outcomes. In the economic literature, the concept of a person's human capital encompasses ability; formal education and qualifications (whether academic or vocational); and skills, competencies and work experience (Blundell et al., 1999). The human capital of youth is especially important, given their current and future role in national economies.

One of three people in the world today is younger than age 25 (Khokhar, n.d.). When infant mortality rates decline but fertility rates remain high, the result is a so-called youth bulge: a high proportion of young people in the country. In the world's 48 least developed countries, children and adolescents comprise a majority of the population (Gupta et al., 2014). In contrast, a lower share of the population of developed countries falls in the 15–29 age bracket: 7 percentage points lower, to be exact (Yifu Lin, 2012). The youth bulge meant that in 2014, 90% of people between ages 10 and 24 lived in developing countries (Gupta et al., 2014).

When the growing number of young people find quality jobs and earn a decent income, society as a whole benefits in what is known as the 'demographic dividend'. In many cases, however, this has not happened.

In the Middle East and North Africa, for example, about 25% of youth are unemployed (Purfield et al., 2018), and double-digit youth unemployment rates are common in the developing world (see Figure 8.1). The International Labour Organization estimates that 13% of young people between 15 and 24 years of age are unemployed around the world (O'Higgins, 2017).

Figure 8.1. Youth unemployment rates across countries



Note: Unemployment, youth total (% of total labour force ages 15–24) (modelled ILO estimate). Youth unemployment refers to the share of the labour force ages 15–24 without work, but available for and seeking employment. The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the International Trade Centre concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Source: World Bank Development Indicators from International Labour Organization, ILOSTAT database. Data retrieved in September 2018.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953831

Even when young people have a job, it may be poor-quality employment with bad pay, long hours or substandard conditions. Long periods of unemployment and underemployment can permanently damage a person's long-term career prospects (Pikoko and Phiri, 2018; Weidenkaff, 2018).

Research underscores the risks posed by large numbers of unemployed and underemployed young people. The dissatisfaction of jobless youth can lead to social unrest and political instability (World Bank, 2011). Young people – defined here as those between ages 15 and 24, unless stated otherwise – are more likely to emigrate if they have no job at home, which impacts both their country of origin and the destination country (Fernando, 2018).

Some 600 million jobs will be needed by 2028 to absorb the current number of unemployed across the globe (World Bank, 2012) and to provide job opportunities to the 40 million people – mostly youth – who enter the labour market each year (ILO, 2012). The magnitude and importance of this challenge have been made clear in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which calls on the international community to 'substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment, education or training' (SDG target 8.6). Therefore, tackling youth unemployment and underemployment is crucial to foster long-term growth and avoid undesirable social outcomes.

Small enterprises have a key role to play

SMEs have significant potential to create jobs for young people in developing countries. They are the cornerstone of most economies. Small and medium-sized enterprises engage upwards of 70% of a country's workforce, account for 35% of GDP and generate 34% of exports (WTO, 2016). In developing countries, these businesses tend to employ the poorer, more vulnerable segments of society (ITC, 2015a).

Small businesses in developing economies hire substantial numbers of young people. Data from ITC SME Competitiveness Surveys in nine developing countries indicate that one in four employees of small and medium-sized businesses is between 18 and 24 years old.[1] SMEs offer important opportunities to absorb the demographic bulge and transform it into a dividend.

Youth skills can help companies go global

Yet SMEs suffer from critical skill shortages that inhibit their hiring of young people and their competitiveness. Globalisation and trade offer new market opportunities, but they have also upped the competitive pressure on firms. The job-relevant knowledge and personal attributes of workers, as well as their understanding of what is needed to do the job (Bacchetta et al., 2017: 27), affect the ability of an enterprise to meet cost, quantity and time requirements for competitiveness.

Human capital can be particularly important in dynamic economic environments, where technological evolution is fast and volatile. In this case, greater human capital can encourage technological diffusion in both the firm and the economy, promoting economic growth (Barro, 1991). This is related to the fact that a skilled workforce can help a company anticipate and adapt to changes in the business environment (Woessmann, 2011).

Investments in human capital, such as preservice education and in-service training, enhance the productivity of SMEs (Miller and Upadhyay, 2000; Vandenberg and Trinh, 2016), contributing to their international competitiveness. The impact of human capital on productivity and competitiveness can help to explain why it is an important determinant of economic growth (Woessmann, 2011).

Some research suggests that there is a significant positive relationship between the level of human capital in SMEs and their tendency to internationalise (Onkelinx et al., 2015). Firms with higher-skilled workers may be better able to adapt their goods and technologies to the national economic environment, facilitating domestic economic diversification and enabling exports of adapted products to neighbouring countries (Bacchetta et al., 2017; ITC, 2017a). Empirically, higher levels of human capital are associated with higher export diversification rates (Cadot et al., 2011).

Workers with education and training can enable companies in developing countries to upgrade their position in global value chains, including by helping them to meet the quality standards of foreign clients (Jansen and Lanz, 2013). Moreover, internationalisation can require soft skills such as presentation, communication and language skills (CEDEFOP, 2010).

Investing in youth skills is a promising strategy to boost human capital for trade. Many developing countries have significant numbers of under- and unemployed young people who could be skilled to measure for the future needs of the labour market. As noted above, the Sustainable Development Goals emphasise the connection between youth skills and employment. SDG 4.4, for example, calls for a substantial increase in the number of youth who have relevant skills – including technical and vocational skills – to promote employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship.

In its response to the 2019 OECD-WTO Aid for Trade Monitoring Questionnaire, the Government of Papua New Guinea highlighted the difficulties that its youth face in securing jobs after graduation and the need to equip young people with the skills to encourage their participation in the economy. Investment in youth education and training has clear long-term benefits in terms of increased employee productivity.


Skill shortages and mismatches curtail employment

Employers in both developed and developing countries complain about the difficulty of finding workers with the skills they require. In Europe, roughly four out of 10 businesses report such problems. About 30% of employers in Peru and Colombia say it is difficult to fill vacancies. Similar or even higher figures can be found elsewhere in the developing world, including in Panama (40%), Mexico (40%), India (60%) and Brazil (70%) (World Economic Forum, 2014).

Skills mismatches typically occur when the skills taught by education institutions do not match the demands of the labour market. This is a well-known source of economic inefficiency (Jansen and Lanz, 2013) that has considerable economic and social costs, particularly youth unemployment.

SMEs that are unable to find employees with the skills they need may hire fewer workers, including youth. Conversely, enterprises that manage to find youth or other jobseekers with appropriate skills are more likely to hire them. Indeed, firm-level survey data suggest that companies that highly rate the availability of skilled people for hire tend to have hired more young workers (see Figure 8.2).

Figure 8.2. Skill shortages and youth employment in SMEs



Note: Firm response to the question "Please rate availability of skilled workers for hire?" Choices included 0= shortage of skilled workers, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5= Plenty of skilled workers. The x-axis measures the percentage of full-time employees below 25 years of age. The relationship between the two variables is the result of a binned scatterplot.[3] A total of 1784 firms were surveyed in Ghana, Kenya, St Lucia, Ukraine and Zambia in 2017 and 2018.

Source: ITC SME Competitiveness Surveys.

When skills are mismatched, businesses may hire unprepared staff. Indeed, one in four adults surveyed in OECD countries reports a mismatch between the skills they have and the skills they need for their current job (World Economic Forum, 2017). In a survey conducted in six developing countries, about 28% of company managers reported that the skill set of their workforce did not match the needs of their firm.[2]

Weaknesses in the skill mix available in the labour market are likely to affect SMEs disproportionally, because they have very limited resources to invest in training. ITC survey data indicate that more than half of large companies in the Gambia provide in-house training, compared with just 38% of micro and small enterprises and 33% of medium-sized enterprises (ITC, 2018a). This is similar to the situation in some OECD countries, where SMEs offer less training than large businesses (Almeida et al., 2012; Green and Martinez-Solano, 2011; Kubisz, 2011).

Giving young people appropriate skills

Ensuring that young people have appropriate training for the workforce can help prevent skills mismatches and the unpreparedness of employees that results. A considerable amount of analysis focuses on effective ways to empower youth by giving them the skills that SMEs need to internationalise.

Official development assistance has helped to address skill shortages to promote the capacity of firms to trade. However, current definitions of Aid for Trade exclude support for technical and vocational skills as well as entrepreneurship programmes. As such, assistance to improve youth skills for trade is not counted in multilateral measures of Aid for Trade.

Initiatives to tackle skill shortages have facilitated consultations between public and private stakeholders. Such collaboration can create solutions to address skills mismatches and the implementation of programmes to support market-relevant technical and vocational training for youth.

Box 8.1. Building skills for tourism in Myanmar: An ILO STED case study

In 2017, the International Labour Organization partnered with the Government of Myanmar to assess the future skills needs of the tourism sector. ILO's Skills for Trade and Economic Diversification (STED) technical assistance tool provided strategic guidance for the assessment of skills development needs. The methodology anticipates sectoral growth opportunities based on global competitive position and market development. Combined with an analysis of skill supply and demand, STED forecasts existing and future skill shortages and supports the formation of skills in demand by the labour market, thereby avoiding skills mismatches and unemployment among young people.

STED was used to conduct an in-depth analysis of the tourism sector and outlook that assessed its growth path and the business development constraints faced by tourist guides. This fed into a forecast of the number of tourist guides that would be needed in the future and the identification of deficiencies in their current skill set.

The project highlighted the need for training on delivering quality customer service, organising and managing small and large groups of people, using social media and other technologies, and applying quality and/or sustainable tourism standards. It also identified a gap between the tourist guide training offered by the Government and what the industry demands in terms of curriculum and specialisation, for example in cultural interpretation, heritage and history.

Recommendations from the project included a call for the Government to continue developing policies for the tourist guide sector. The project also suggested that establishing public-private sector mechanisms could make it easier to share knowledge and perceptions from industry with policymakers to ensure that tourist guides in Myanmar receive appropriate skills training.

Source: Steve Noakes, Paul Rogers, Ma. Concepcion Sardaña, Qingrui Huang, Sandar Win. 2016. Skills for Trade and Economic Diversification: Tourist Guides Sector, Myanmar. Geneva: ILO.

Providing foundational skills can be an important contribution of such programmes. Skills in information and communication technologies can help young people secure jobs and succeed as entrepreneurs (Coward et al., 2014). In addition, financial literacy and life skills training can assist youth in preparing for new economic opportunities.

Forging effective partnerships

Partnerships between the private sector, government and local education institutions are vital for upskilling and reskilling. Learning programmes are more effective when all stakeholders are involved, with co-funded models showing strong potential. These are typical of successful vocational education systems, such as that of Germany (ITC, 2018b). Aid for Trade programmes that strengthen the ability of technical and vocational education and training (TVET) institutions to meet industry needs have documented positive and significant impacts on youth employment (Tripney et al., 2013).

Nevertheless, building sustainable public-private partnerships for vocational training and education is not straightforward. For instance, it has been difficult to replicate successful apprenticeship systems in countries that lack the relevant historical and institutional arrangements.

Linking training programmes with job placement

Formalised mechanisms for collaboration between private enterprises and educational institutions help ensure that training actually leads to employment. Informational and operational linkages between TVET institutions and industry enables the private sector to provide input in the design of market-relevant training for young people. This means the sectoral, skills and technological focuses of training programmes can equip graduates with the capabilities that businesses seek when hiring.

The risk of a mismatch between training and the job market can be minimised, for example, through improved programme design (The Mastercard Foundation, 2015). The Skills for Youth Employment Fund is a results-based competitive funding approach that aims to ease the transition from skills training programmes to the world of work. To obtain support through the fund, which ITC and the Gambia's National Accreditation and Quality Assurance Authority launched in February 2017, training programmes must target identified skill shortages and lead to work or to the establishment of small viable businesses. This requires participating TVETs to engage closely with industry to ensure post-training placement, and to understand start-up potential and opportunities. Moreover, to link these programmes to measurable outcomes, part of the funding is dispensed only upon proof of the successful employment or self-employment of trainees.

Customising skills programmes to ensure inclusiveness

Opportunities to develop skills are not available to everyone. Rural youth, for instance, often struggle to find appropriate training (ITC, 2018: 42). Customised training programmes could be created, or core training modules adapted, to include disadvantaged youth.

The *A Ganar Vencedoras* programme deployed donor funding to offer skills training to young Brazilian women. The programme found that they were dealing with specific problems – such as domestic violence, low self-esteem or child-care issues – that hindered their entry into the labour market. Staff realised that the training had to be adapted to address these issues in order to maintain engagement in the programme (Multilateral Investment Fund, 2012: 14). Training for disabled youth and indigenous groups may similarly have to be customised to address their particular challenges.

Table 8.1. Checklist of best practices to skill youth for employability and exports

1. Public-private collaboration to identify skills mismatches and design training	✓ Informal and/or institutionalised collaboration between TVETs and firms in private sector ✓ Identification of missing skills ✓ Design of appropriate training programmes
2. Ensure trained youth get jobs by strengthening training institutions	✓ Improve capacity of TVETs to deliver job-relevant training programmes ✓ Monitor participant placement in employment or entrepreneurship
3. Customise training programmes for disadvantaged youth	✓ Ensure programme structure and logistics facilitate participation by female and rural youth ✓ Address their constraints to employability

PROMOTING SELF-EMPLOYMENT AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP


Some young people are agents of change in their society who create jobs and solve social problems through the enterprises they create. Youth are 1.6 times more likely to start-up a new business than people over age 35 (Schott et al., 2015). Many new businesses are created in developing countries, which on average have more nascent and young companies than established firms (Kew et al., 2013).

Youth self-employment and entrepreneurship can be an enticing career option in this context. Indeed, 60% of youth in developing countries consider entrepreneurship to be a good career choice and believe that having a successful business brings a higher status in society (Kew et al., 2013).

One in four young people around the world are entrepreneurs or self-employed, according to the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) 2015 survey.[4] This section follows GEM and the literature in defining youth entrepreneurs as those between 18 and 34 years of age. Although some youth turn to entrepreneurship because of a limited job market, others do so by choice. Roughly 40% of young people who start their own business do so out of necessity. The remaining 60% of young entrepreneurs are seeking to capitalise on an opportunity they have identified (Schott et al., 2015).

When young people are driven to self-employment out of necessity, they risk exposure to poor working conditions and a struggle for subsistence. Many youth are self-employed in precarious informal sector activities in a vulnerable employment situation (ILO, 2010). In this context, support should help young people find a better, decent job. In other situations, youth entrepreneurship can involve decent working conditions with real potential to lead to improved livelihoods, competitiveness and participation in international trade.

Figure 8.3. Youth entrepreneurship rates by country and gender



Note: Youth 18–34 years of age

Source: ITC calculations, based on GEM 2015 APS Global Individual Level Data.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953850

Entrepreneurship is popular, but difficult

Entrepreneurial activity varies widely from one country to another. Figure 8.3 ranks 60 countries according to the percentage of youth between 18 to 34 years of age who are creating, or already own, a business. In Senegal, 40% of young men are engaged in entrepreneurial activity, compared with just 1.6% in Malaysia.

Entrepreneurial activity also varies across gender, with men more likely than women to start their own businesses. Still, there are significant cross-country differences in the ratio of male to female entrepreneurial activity among youth. In the Philippines and Peru, for instance, young women are more entrepreneurially involved than men, while in Chile and Lebanon, the opposite is the case.


In light of high rates of youth entrepreneurship, it is not surprising that youth-led firms account for a substantial share of new businesses. Almost 44% of the world's entrepreneurs are between 18 and 35 years of age. Yet many youth-led start-ups do not survive: the evidence indicates that the established business rate among youth is significantly lower than for adults (Decent Jobs for Youth, n.d.: 4).

Analysis of data across countries indicates that young entrepreneurs tend to be on average more oriented towards exports than older entrepreneurs (Schott et al., 2015). The relative propensity of youth-led firms to import and export, compared to companies led by older entrepreneurs, appears to vary by country, sector and the length of time the firm has been operating.

Firm-level data from ITC SME Competitiveness Surveys offer mixed evidence on whether youth-led firms are more or less likely to internationalise. Youth-led enterprises in Ghana and Hungary are less likely to export than businesses led by their elders, but the opposite is the case in Kenya. GEM data show that youth-led firms export relatively less in the manufacturing and primary sectors, though they appear to export as much as other companies in the services sector.

Finally, young entrepreneurs tend to hire more young workers, according to firm-level data (see Figure 8.4).

Figure 8.4. Young managers hire more young people



Note: ITC SME Competitiveness Surveys. A total of 2047 firms were surveyed in Morocco, Argentina, Hungary, the Gambia, Kenya, Ghana, Zambia and Ukraine in 2016–2018.

Source: ITC SME Competitiveness Surveys 2016–2018 in Morocco, Argentina, Saint Lucia, Hungary, the Gambia, Kenya, Ghana, Zambia and Ukraine.

Management skills are essential for competitiveness

Given that youth lead a significant share of new enterprises and contribute to the innovative capacities of SMEs, the obstacles they face are an important constraint to economic growth. Young people around the globe identify common obstacles to their entrepreneurship, including access to finance and the lack of appropriate skills, infrastructure, support structures and mentorship. Indeed, in its response to the 2019 OECD-WTO Aid for Trade monitoring exercise, Madagascar cited the 'lack of experience and start-up funding' as major barriers to youth entrepreneurship.

Research indicates that a substantial proportion of young people who start businesses have no entrepreneurial education and, as such, lack knowledge about financing possibilities and business support services as well as the managerial capacities necessary for success (Schoof, 2006; Schott et al., 2015: 27). Youth-led firms are not alone in contending with inadequate managerial skills; many small enterprises fail for this reason.

SMEs are often limited by the inability of their management to set up and implement strategies to develop skills, adopt new strategies and technology, expand into new sectors or new markets, or even to prepare effective requests for financing. This impedes their growth and is reflected in higher failure rates.

Box 8.2. Mashrou3i youth entrepreneurship in Tunisia

Mashrou3i ('my project' in Arabic) is a joint project of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the United States Agency for International Development, the Italian Development Cooperation and the HP Foundation. Mashrou3i is designed to facilitate youth employment in Tunisia and to support the creation and growth of enterprises.

Mashrou3i empowers aspiring entrepreneurs to succeed in running their own businesses, creating jobs for themselves and others. The project leverages the HP Foundation's Learning Initiative for Entrepreneurs (HP LIFE) e-Learning program to equip young people with entrepreneurial skills and mindsets to start and grow their businesses. It also provides deep-dive business coaching and technical assistance to startups and existing enterprises in areas such as finance, communication and marketing.

Focus is also placed on ensuring young people have the information and networks they need to pursue their business ventures. To strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem, Mashrou3i enhances the capacity of local business support institutions and is also enriching the curricula of higher education institutions with business and IT tools.

Source: UNIDO., https://mashrou3i.tn/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Mashrou3i_Brochure_EN_WEB.pdf

Learning even elementary management skills in planning, marketing and financial literacy can improve management practices, increase the willingness of owners to pay for follow-up training and boost survival chances (Otsuka and Sonobe, 2011; Sonobe and Otsuka, 2006). Research indicates that the performance of a company is closely linked to the competence of its manager (Hambrick and Mason, 1984). Management practices can improve productivity (Syverson, 2011), as well as growth and longevity (Bloom and Van Reenen, 2010).

Although there are interventions to teach proper management skills, empirical evidence on their impact is statistically weak. The impact of such training programmes is much stronger, however, if they are provided to owners of firms that are struggling to survive, where the lack of managerial skills is a major impediment to innovation and growth (Yoshino, 2011). As such, entrepreneurial training programmes for youth-led firms close to survival can be a valuable form of technical assistance insofar as they address management capacity gaps that would otherwise decimate the youth-led SME sector.

Youth entrepreneurship spurs innovation and fosters diversification

Investments in youth entrepreneurship yield benefits that stretch beyond the young people in question. Youth-led companies can stimulate innovation across the SME landscape. Both globalisation and rapid advances in new technologies have put the creation and delivery of innovative products and services at the forefront of competition. Firms need to innovate to strengthen their competitive position.

A firm's capacity to innovate – its ability to generate innovative outputs (Neely et al., 2001) or more broadly, its ability to continuously transform knowledge and ideas into new products, processes and systems for the benefit of the firm and its stakeholders (Lawson and Samson, 2001) – is strongly linked to its technological capabilities.

Young entrepreneurs may bring new technologies to the business landscape that can help SMEs connect to global markets. They use foundational technologies, such as personal computing and productivity tools, and connectivity tools such as the internet and mobile technology. They have an online presence and use social networks alongside enterprise-enabling cloud-based services.

Furthermore, as recent graduates of educational programmes, they may have recent experience in research and development that bodes well for innovation. Although young entrepreneurs often base their firms on new ideas and have inherent innovative potential, their ability to spend money on research and development depends on their access to finance, the scale of their enterprise and its age.

Youth innovate in response to local problems and opportunities. Young people are deeply rooted in the social and economic context of their country, and craft innovative solutions that they commercialise through entrepreneurship. As 'digital natives' who grew up with online technology (McPherson, 2008), they adapt information and communication technology (ICT) to local conditions, thereby helping to create appropriate ICT for firm competitiveness (EY, 2016). In the Gambia, for example, young people (under age 35) owned half of the ICT firms that were interviewed in 2017 for the ITC SME Competitiveness Survey (ITC, 2018a).

Box 8.3. Youth IT start-ups in the Zaatari refugee camp in Jordan

The Jordanian population is approximately 7.9 million, with an estimated 1.3 million Syrian refugees.[5] The International Trade Centre's Refugee Employment and Skills Initiative seeks to help Jordan improve the economic resilience of refugees and equip them with the right skills to be able to return home and earn an income when peace is restored.

The project provides vocational training to help young refugees in the Zaatari refugee camp in northern Jordan develop their ability to work as freelance entrepreneurs in online services. During the training programme, participants are taught how to register for digital platforms, boost their activities on online marketplaces and manage online transactions and sales. They develop specific capacities in online services such as graphic design and web development with support from online coaching and one-on-one mentoring. In addition to building skills, the project helps young people generate sustainable sources of income.

Furthermore, ITC partners with a select group of Jordanian enterprises to include specific inputs from Syrian refugees and integrate them into export value chains for business process outsourcing services. In parallel, the project assesses Jordan's positioning and offerings of these outsourcing services for export, analyses the structure of the sector and identifies specific gaps in relatively low-skilled areas that can be filled using the capacity of Syrian refugees assisting Jordanian nationals.

Source: ITC

Young entrepreneurs are increasingly associated with efforts to find business solutions to social challenges and to leverage new technologies. Indeed, there is greater representation of social entrepreneurs than nascent commercial entrepreneurs among those between ages 18 and 34 in the Middle East and North Africa, sub-Saharan Africa and Western Europe regions (Fernando, 2018). Additionally, young Africans with novel approaches on how to address social and environmental problems head many of the start-ups participating in accelerators in Nigeria's 'Yabacon Valley' (ITC, 2019b).

Youth entrepreneurship can also promote economic diversification. Youth-led businesses catalyse economic activities in new, higher-growth sectors and activities (ITC, 2015: 22).

In China, for example, research shows that young returnee migrants in south Jiangxi start up new businesses in their natal communities that promote the economic diversification of the region (Murphy, 2000). Nigeria is targeting education and business environment reforms with a view to facilitating youth entrepreneurship for economic diversification into new sectors (Akpomujere, 2017; Joel et al., 2017).

Youth entrepreneurship is also being encouraged to take advantage of export diversification opportunities through incremental changes to activities within existing export industries. In several African countries, for instance, youth-led companies are pioneering in agribusiness activities that build on existing agricultural sector expertise and extend it to higher-value and more stable exports into global value chains.

Youth-led firms need a supportive business ecosystem

The success of young entrepreneurs depends on the supportiveness of their business ecosystem (Business 20, 2015). Can a young e-business pioneer acquire financial literacy training? Is financing available? Helping youth-led businesses internationalise and grow entails strengthening the environment in which young entrepreneurs operate as well as the level of assistance they receive.

Components of a business ecosystem differ, depending on whether they support a small or a large enterprise, a start-up or a mature firm, a high-tech or a low-tech company (ITC, 2018b). The business ecosystem of youth entrepreneurs includes both formal and informal institutions. For-profit organisations – including buyers, suppliers, distributors, financial actors and certifying bodies – and non-profit bodies – including education providers, standard-setters and chambers of commerce – make up their business ecosystem.

Local infrastructure is also part of the business ecosystem of youth entrepreneurs. This is because high-quality, local digital and transport infrastructure is a prerequisite for using new, digitally driven technologies to innovate and for international trade. In sum, the business ecosystem starts at the boundary of the enterprise and ends at the border of the country with national institutions or regulations (ITC, 2018b).

Facilitating access to finance and business support institutions

Deeply rooted prejudices against lending to youth and disadvantaged groups, as well as collateral and other requirements (discussed in greater detail below), are preventing many young people from accessing financial services. Finance from friends and family helps to some degree, particularly in the early stages. One survey found that, on average, 51% of youth-led start-up financing comes from personal savings, while 22% comes from family savings, 19% from a bank or other financial institution, 3% from friends and 5% from other sources (Schott et al., 2015: 22). Other funding sources are needed as firms expand and mature, but these are not always available (ITC, 2019b).

Youth trade accelerators can help address this issue by offering training, coaching/mentoring, institutional support and access to finance to aspiring young entrepreneurs. Programmes create an ecosystem of institutions, advisers, mentors and investors to support youth-owned SMEs with tailored services as springboards to access international markets. Such institutions can help youth obtain appropriate information, including on markets, networking and investment.

In the absence of accelerators and other youth-centred programmes, business support institutions can provide access to financial literacy training and business development support services. This is crucial for young entrepreneurs to create, develop and scale-up sustainable enterprises.

Social networks can nurture an entrepreneurial spirit

Social norms can shape the attitudes of young people towards entrepreneurship, taking initiative and leadership, affecting their decision to start a business and their subsequent choices as business owners (Schoof, 2006).

One social norm that can deter potential entrepreneurs from setting up a business is the fear of failure. The 2015 Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Global Report reveals that respondents in the European Union have the greatest fear of failure (40.7%), followed by those in Asia and Oceania (37.5%). Negative peer pressure, social stigma, lack of confidence due to insufficient knowledge and skills, absence of respectable exit routes without economic penalties and low aspirations can aggravate these fears (UN-ESCAP, 2012).

Providing entrepreneurial skills can address these fears to some extent. GEM found that people who are confident that they possess the skills to start a business are four to six times more likely to be involved in entrepreneurial activity (Kew et al., 2013: 17).

The social networks to which young people belong can also allay the discouraging effects of certain social norms, while providing connections for SME success. Networks and peer-to-peer support provide young business leaders with sources of motivation, ideas, information, business partners, employees, customers and advice. Networks can help identify promising opportunities, mobilise financial resources, diffuse information, find affordable technology and foster innovation (Stuart and Sorenson, 2005). The nature of networks varies widely, from private networks (family and friends) and market networks (business collaborators) to identity-based networks (e.g. ethnic affiliation), as does the strength of ties between actors (OECD, 2014).

Evidence from India shows that business counselling and assistance had a significant and immediate impact on the business activity of female participants – but only if they were trained in the presence of a friend. Those trained with a friend were more likely to take out new business loans (Field et al., 2015). Indeed, entrepreneurs who network with a new business owner before they themselves create an enterprise are more capable of discovering and exploiting international opportunities and eventually exporting (Evald et al., 2011).

The availability of high-quality mentoring has been central to the success of initiatives that help young entrepreneurs go global. Survey data from young entrepreneurs show that programmes facilitating mentorship improved their confidence, decision-making skills, business development and self-understanding, eventually yielding benefits in terms of successful business creation and higher turnover (Middlesex University and Youth Business International, 2016).

Mentors give young entrepreneurs expert advice from relevant business networks. While youth accelerators and other brick-and-mortar forums are crucial in this respect, not all young people can access a physical entrepreneurial space. Online forums for learning and collaborating are thus essential.[6] The Libyan Online Entrepreneurship School, for example, is a virtual learning space that facilitates continuous growth for young Libyan entrepreneurs. This platform gives them the opportunity to attend courses, access resources, exchange ideas, and communicate with mentors and with each other.


Tailoring support for young women entrepreneurs

There is an opportunity to better incorporate a gender perspective into Aid for Trade initiatives for youth entrepreneurship. Recent evidence suggests that young men and women start businesses using different approaches and have different needs. Some studies indicate that young businesswomen are more entrepreneurial than their male counterparts. One reason for this is that young women seem to enjoy their independence and the ability to expand their options more than young men, who often turn to business because formal employment opportunities are limited (ILO/ECA, 2009; Solomon, 2010).

Women in low-income countries tend to be more self-confident about their ability to become entrepreneurs than women in developed countries. They are also less afraid to fail than women in middle- and high-income economies. Rates of female entrepreneurship tend to be higher in developing countries than in developed economies, perhaps because women face greater barriers to enter the formal labour market in the developing world and turn to entrepreneurship as an alternative (Minniti and Naudé, 2010a).

Nonetheless, young women say they have lower levels of entrepreneurial competencies than young men (see Figure 8.5), who are 1.2 times more likely to be confident in their ability to run a business ('self-efficacy') and 1.3 times more likely to personally know a start-up entrepreneur than young women (Schott et al., 2015).

Figure 8.5. Self-reported youth entrepreneurial competencies, by gender



Note: Percentage of surveyed 18–35 year old female and male entrepreneurs who said they had that competency, 2012–2014.

Source: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2015. Future Potential – A GEM perspective on youth entrepreneurship: 24.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953869

Even when women have the skills and knowledge, opportunities and incentives may prevent them from starting or continuing a business. Young mothers are more likely than non-married women to become entrepreneurs, but they are also more likely to quit a business voluntarily. Furthermore, evidence suggests that female entrepreneurs in developing countries are involved in multiple projects. They are portfolio entrepreneurs rather than serial entrepreneurs as they attempt to diversify income sources (Minniti and Naudé, 2010b).

These findings suggest that many young women choose entrepreneurship as a way to escape unemployment and poverty. Still, while the data confirm that young women are more likely than young men to start a business out of necessity, the difference is small: 41% cite necessity as the reason they began their business, compared with 35% of men (Schott et al., 2015: 25).

Still, it is clear that the primary concern motivating the business strategy of some female entrepreneurs is survival rather than growth. Helping these enterprises can have a very strong impact on the Sustainable Development Goals, because income earned by women is more likely to be invested in children's education, health and nutrition (Morrison et al., 2007).

Interventions can help such firms move along the continuum of business development from a focus on survival to growth and export. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that some women-led businesses in the developing world start with the aim of growing and innovating.

Regardless of the motives and origins of young female entrepreneurs, supporting them requires an understanding of their unique business environment.

Women entrepreneurs face specific challenges in building a successful export business (ITC, 2015b). Pervasive and persistent discrimination affects their relationship with customers, their security in the marketplace and their access to services (Solomon, 2010). Discrimination also excludes young women from the social networks that their male peers use for information, advice and finance (Schott et al., 2015: 25). In some countries, there are legal impediments to female business ownership and success, such as business registrations that require the approval of a male family member and the absence of government sanctions on gender-based decision-making in financial institutions.

In Indonesia, more than three quarters of female entrepreneurs interviewed by ITC said that women-led enterprises do not internationalise as much as those owned or led by men. Some of them blamed the perpetuation of gender roles. However, others said it was because women were less confident and competitive, and 80% said that being a women-owned company negatively affected the credibility of their business (ITC, 2017b).

ITC business surveys on non-tariff measures show that exporting firms headed by women report procedural obstacles to trade more frequently than those led by men. In particular, female-owned micro firms report more procedural barriers due to 'informal or high payments' and 'discriminatory behaviour' than male-owned micro firms (ITC, 2016: 50).

Furthermore, gender-blind trade policies may have gender-biased impacts – for example, through tariffs that are higher on goods produced by women (such as textiles and clothing) and non-tariff barriers that are particularly stringent in women-dominated sectors (such as agriculture). Considering these factors when negotiating and applying trade rules can facilitate the development of a gender-responsive trade policy system (Avsar and Piovani, 2019).

Table 8.2. Checklist of best practices to support youth entrepreneurship

1. Improve access of young entrepreneurs to relevant skills	✓ Improve the scale and quality of entrepreneurship education and skills development, coaching and mentoring ✓ Facilitate the acquisition of management skills and financial literacy
2. Link youth-led companies to appropriate business ecosystem	✓ Create youth accelerators and other brick-and-mortar support centres ✓ Support peer and mentoring networks ✓ Promote and enhance online hubs and communities for young entrepreneurs
3. Tailor support to address barriers affecting young female entrepreneurs	✓ Address legal impediments ✓ Reduce procedural obstacles ✓ Make trade policy gender-responsive

Source: ITC and the Global Initiative on Decent Jobs for Youth, Youth Entrepreneurship and Self-Employment thematic area action document (ITC, ILO, UNIDO, UNCDF, UNCTAD).

Aid for Trade initiatives are beginning to address the constraints that young women face when starting a business in developing countries. Peer training and mentoring, along with consideration of the constraints that young businesswomen face when training initiatives are designed, improve programme effectiveness (ILO/ECA, 2009; Solomon, 2010). ITC's SheTrades initiative gives young women entrepreneurs from around the world a unique network and platform to connect to markets.

GOVERNMENTS CAN STIMULATE YOUTH EMPOWERMENT

The competitiveness of firms that hire young people (and are led by them) are affected by the national environment in which they operate. This chapter has thus far examined the role of firm-level capabilities and the business ecosystem in youth economic empowerment. Yet the broader national context – and government action in particular – affects whether firms hire youth, and influences whether these businesses thrive and go global.

Governments have an important role to play in fostering youth economic empowerment through a conducive national policy environment. Public policy can address market failures that hinder the ability of young people to play a part in supporting the competitiveness of the country in international markets.

In addition, governments are uniquely positioned to assess future opportunities in global markets. Through multi-stakeholder consultations, they can identify value chains where today's targeted programmes could prepare youth for tomorrow's exports.

Policy can help tackle market failures that exclude youth

Several categories of market failures can limit the ability of young people to contribute to the country's international competitiveness.


As argued above, skills mismatches can undermine youth employment and SME competitiveness. Governments can help reduce skills mismatches by establishing suitable national educational curriculum and facilitating collaboration between trade-related and education-related institutions.

In Singapore, for instance, the Ministry of Trade and Industry and the National Manpower Council created an interlocking system of communication and interaction among government bodies, the private sector and higher education and training institutions to ensure that workforce skill demands were translated into changes in the population skill set. These initiatives have been crucial to the country's successful upskilling of its workforce in the last 40 years (Kuruvilla et al., 2002).

Financial market failures can exclude young people from formal credit. Young people often lack the collateral and credit history that banks require before providing credit. For this reason, start-ups founded by 18–24 year olds are 6% less likely to use financing from banks and other financial institutions than those run by 35–64 year olds (Schott et al., 2015: 25).

Firm-level survey data from ITC indicate that youth-led businesses are more constrained by poor access to finance, with 76% reporting that access to financial institutions is an obstacle to current operations, compared to 59% of non-youth-led companies (see Figure 8.6). Some established youth start-ups appear able to obtain family and personal savings to compensate for the lack of formal sector financing. However, no data are available on the number of youth-led enterprises that were not created, or whose potential was severely curtailed, because of financial constraints.

Figure 8.6. Access to finance is more of an obstacle for youth-led firms



Note: Firm response to the question 'To what degree is access to financial institutions an obstacle to current operations?' Choices included 5= very severe obstacle, 4= very bad obstacle 3=bad obstacle 2= somewhat an obstacle 1= small obstacle 0=no obstacle and do not know. All respondents who chose anything besides 'no obstacle' are categorized as selecting 'some obstacle'. Firms are considered youth-led if their top manager is below 35 years of age.

Source: ITC SME Competitiveness Surveys. A total of 1308 firms were surveyed in Argentina, Hungary, Kenya, Morocco and The Gambia in 2017 and 2018.

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953888


Governments can step in to correct these financial market failures through credit guarantee programmes, seed capital and financial literacy initiatives. The Government of Kazakhstan, for example, has provided credit guarantees to young entrepreneurs through its support to the Damu Entrepreneurship Development Fund (OECD, 2018). The Government of Mauritius provided seed capital to the SME equity fund, which invests in domestic early-stage SMEs. In South Africa, the public sector Financial Services Board collaborated with the South African Insurance Association to develop financial education materials and trained many educators and learners in their classroom use (Sibanda and Sibanda, 2016: 15).

Legal and social restrictions may prevent young people, and particularly women, from owning land and/or businesses. Regulations that prohibit age and gender-based discrimination can help youth gain control of the assets they need to boost productivity, innovate and become globally competitive.

Investment in the information and communications technology infrastructure, and indeed basic infrastructure, can improve SME competitiveness through access to web-based job portals to identify qualified youth. Enhanced ICT infrastructure is also crucial to the ability of youth-led enterprises to go global, because it can help them access markets overseas.

Mobile phones have proven to be an important business tool, especially for young rural female entrepreneurs, as they enable them to expand their business through improved marketing, location of customers, improved communication and time savings (UNCTAD, 2014). In addition to improved information and connectivity, ICT can allow youth to multiply the benefits they reap from access to new technologies, such as green technologies, crowdfunding and credit platforms.

Figure 8.7. How Aid for Trade can best contribute to youth economic empowerment



Note: Developing country governments were asked, through the Aid for Trade monitoring and evaluation survey, 'How best can Aid for Trade make a contribution to youth economic empowerment?' They were allowed to choose up to five options. In all, 84 governments responded. Figure 8.7 reflects the percentage of the total choices that were accounted for by each option.

Source: OECD-WTO Aid for Trade monitoring exercise (2019).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953907

Official development assistance can also play a role in addressing these issues. Indeed, when asked how Aid for Trade can best contribute to youth economic empowerment, developing country governments reiterated these priorities (see Figure 8.7). An important share of responses highlighted how Aid for Trade could help provide access to finance, upgrade skills and improve access to information and digital connectivity, echoing the need to address the market failures described in this subsection. Respondents also noted opportunities to improve access to global value chains, which as the next subsection notes can be facilitated by Aid for Trade to government sectoral strategies for youth.

Strategies to identify and create opportunities for youth

A coherent government strategy can identify priority sectors and skills that have export potential and are interesting to young people. Besides generating jobs for youth and helping SMEs become more competitive, this can improve the national trade balance and encourage growth.

The International Trade Centre has worked with several governments to help craft youth and trade roadmaps. By focusing attention on the role of young people in key sectors, youth and trade strategies can stimulate diversification of production, value addition and exports.

Stakeholders can guide decisions on youth trade strategies


Consultations with stakeholders not only generate quantitative information about the economy, but they also draw attention to strategic opportunities for youth in the economy. Consultations solicit input from policymakers, trade and investment support institutions, the private sector and civil society during meetings that help to identify sectors and activities where youth can promote the country's exports (ITC, 2018d).

It is crucial to listen to young people and to empower them to solve the problems they face during the consultation and strategy-building process. The Ministry of Education of Liberia, for example, convened a National Policy Dialogue on education for youth skills development for employment, which brought together government, industry and youth organisations (Arai, 2010; Association for the Development of Education in Africa, n.d.). Including youth when formulating policy ensures that solutions are appropriate and attractive to them. The ongoing involvement of young people in policymaking is a goal in itself that can also improve support for policy and ease implementation.

ITC-supported youth and trade strategizing by governments targets priority sectors with the help of information gathered through stakeholder consultations. Priority sectors are selected based on their contribution to a development goal (such as employment generation, poverty reduction or regional inclusion), ability to promote the country's long-term competitiveness potential and capacity to offer youth jobs and entrepreneurship opportunities.

For each sector, a value chain analysis is conducted that forecasts the best opportunities for young people. Identifying youth-relevant activities within sectoral value chains can highlight pre-production, processing and final market prospects for employment.

Figure 8.8. Staffing needs in the Tunisian textile and clothing sector



Note: The firm survey in the Tunisian textile and clothing sector asked enterprises what top three professions they were seeking to fill. For example, 42% of respondent firms said they are most in need of machine operators, and 27% of firms said the second-most sought after employees are manufacturing supervisors.

Source: ITC. Stratégie sur l'intégration et l'employabilité des jeunes dans le secteur textile et habillement.


StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953926

In Tunisia, for instance, the high export and youth empowerment potential of the textile and clothing sector led ITC to help design a strategy. Analysis of firm-level data showed an acute need for machine operators and supervisors (see Figure 8.8). This information is shaping the education and training plans of Tunisian youth (ITC, 2019c).

After identifying the biggest occupational gaps in target sectors, the ITC youth and trade strategizing methodology analyses gaps in skills. An assessment of the needed skills and levels of preparedness in priority sectors is linked to TVET future planning, to ensure that training institutions help young people develop the capabilities for future job opportunities. This is complemented by a sector-specific analysis of the constraints to youth employment.

In the Gambia, for example, more than half of the companies in the tourism sector cited inadequate qualifications and the cost of workers as the top barriers to hiring young people. Qualifications were not a major issue in the information and communications technology sector, though the work ethic of young people was reported as a hiring obstacle by companies in both the ICT and the agricultural sectors (see Figure 8.9).

Figure 8.9. Barriers to hiring Gambian youth, by sector



Note: The graph is based on firms' responses to the following question: 'In your opinion, what is the greatest barrier to employing young people among the following?'

Source: ITC, SME Competitiveness Survey, the Gambia (2017).

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953945

Finally, an analysis of export requirements in priority sectors is used to help youth-led firms build their niche in growing export markets (ITC, 2018d).

Creating a shared vision and plan for youth economic empowerment

A coherent government strategy can guide policymakers, institutions and the private sector towards progressive youth economic empowerment. A strategy with a clear vision and prioritised actions can facilitate the inclusion of youth in export and import activities.

Table 8.3. Checklist of best practices in government strategy for youth economic empowerment

1. Facilitate access to finance	✓ Boost availability of financial services specifically targeting youth ✓ Increase access to finance for young entrepreneurs through innovative financial mechanisms ✓ Equip young entrepreneurs with financial capabilities
2. Address market failures	✓ Facilitate collaboration between trade and education institutions ✓ Tackle age- and gender-based discrimination ✓ Provide ICT and basic infrastructure
3. Prioritise sectors	✓ Facilitate inclusive consultation ✓ Choose sectors that have high export and youth potential ✓ Reinforce market linkages and integration into value chains and identify value chain development needs ✓ Align skills training and entrepreneurship support programmes
4. Craft strategic plan	✓ Create shared vision for youth in trade ✓ Set out a plan of action in target sectors and across economy ✓ Clarify resourcing and responsibilities ✓ Monitor progress

A national-level analysis assesses key cross-cutting elements driving the inclusion of youth in export-led development. This part of the strategy lays out the vision and defines youth-centred trade and competitiveness priorities. National policy priorities to address barriers to youth economic empowerment may also be laid out here. Examples include improving the quality of the youth business ecosystem through trade procedures, offering incentives for research and development, developing market-oriented skills and establishing institutional forums for youth representation and collaboration.

Strategies also pinpoint the sectors and skills that have been identified as having export potential and which are interesting to young people. They detail an approach to attract youth to the sectors and economic activities that leverage the country's comparative and competitive advantages (ITC, 2018d).

Each ITC-led youth and trade roadmap includes a strategic plan of action specifying concrete steps to achieve the national and sectoral objectives of the youth and trade strategy. A master implementation plan complements sector- and actor-specific strategies that transform identified challenges and opportunities into explicit actions.

When resources are limited, realistic targets are set to make it easier to effectively allocate these resources to the sectors and initiatives that count. In the Gambia, for instance, policymakers focused resources on youth entrepreneurship programmes in the ICT sector because so many young entrepreneurs were active in there.

Resourcing and institutional requirements for implementation should be complemented by a monitoring framework that includes realistic target indicators. A definite yet manageable time-frame can facilitate coordinated action.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter has drawn attention to the twin problems of youth unemployment and SME competitiveness. SMEs that are understaffed will remain uncompetitive on domestic and global markets, restricting their ability to create jobs, grow and trade. Harnessing the potential of young women and men is not only desirable, it is critical to fulfil the Sustainable Development Goals (notably SDG 8).

Economically empowering youth in SMEs could solve both of these problems. Small firms in developing countries hire local youth and provide on-the-job training and experience that can be a gateway to a career, thereby working towards SDG 8 on decent work for youth. At the same time, youth can help developing countries increase exports by boosting the human capital of firms and fostering innovation, thereby contributing to SDG 9 on innovation and SDG 17 on international trade. Aid for Trade designed to empower youth economically is thus a win-win opportunity to support the well-being of young people and promote international trade for economic development.

One way to make this happen is by matching youth skills to company needs. Programmes that make sure the skills taught by educational institutions align with the needs of SMEs can help young people find jobs. Indeed, firm-level survey data show that enterprises reporting an adequate supply of skilled workers tend to have hired more young employees.

At the same time, improved youth skills lead to greater firm-level human capital. This, according to the economic literature, encourages exports and facilitates export diversification.

Tackling barriers to youth entrepreneurship can also buoy SME competitiveness and youth economic empowerment. About a quarter of young people across the globe are self-employed or entrepreneurs, but many lack the necessary entrepreneurship skills and networks. Aid for Trade can help them develop their businesses, including by boosting management skills to improve the competitiveness of their firms. Doing so ensures the survival of many SMEs and can thereby promote economic growth.

Enterprises headed by young women have specific needs and potential. Young women may be interested in entrepreneurship, but may lack confidence in their ability to run a business. Furthermore, they may be excluded from the social networks that their male peers use for information, advice and finance, and may face discrimination in trade policies and practices. Customised programmes for young women can take these circumstances into account and yield significant sustainable development benefits.

Governments have a major role to play to promote youth economic empowerment for international trade. They can address market failures that specifically hinder youth-led firms, such as limited access to finance. With firm-level surveys finding that 76% of youth-led enterprises face financial obstacles to their operations, compared with just 59% of companies headed by their older counterparts, it is clear that more effort must be made to address the exclusion of young people from financial services.

Aid for Trade can play a role here. The 2019 OECD-WTO monitoring and evaluation survey identified greater access to finance as the most important contribution that Aid for Trade can make to empower youth economically.

Finally, governments can chart the course forward using youth and trade roadmaps. These roadmaps can reshape the trade pattern of the economy by identifying sectors with export potential that are of interest to youth. Through participatory consultations and a practical plan, roadmaps can ensure that young men and women are empowered to participate in international trade.

NOTES

1. Data are from firm-level surveys in the following countries in 2017 and 2018: Saint Lucia, Zambia, Hungary, Ukraine, Argentina, Morocco, Ghana, Kenya and the Gambia.
2. SME Competitiveness Surveys in Argentina, Saint Lucia, Kenya, Ghana, Zambia and Ukraine. Answers ranged from 0 to 5, where 0 is 'poor match' and 5 is 'good match'.
3. Binned scatterplots are a non-parametric method of plotting the conditional expectation function (which describes the average y-value for each x-value). To generate a binned scatterplot, binscatter groups the x-axis variable into 20 equal-sized bins, computes the mean of the x-axis and y-axis variables within each bin, and then creates a scatterplot of these data points. By default, binscatter also plots a linear fit line using Ordinary Least Squares, which represents the best linear approximation of the conditional expectation function.
4. Self-employment entails work as the owner of a business that has been established for some time, while entrepreneurs are planning, creating and nurturing new businesses. Although the two concepts are thus technically distinct, most young people who work for themselves identify as entrepreneurs. Following this stylised fact, we use the two terms interchangeably in this chapter.
5. These figures are from 2015, the most recent year for which data are available on both registered and unregistered Syrian refugees in Jordan. Subsequent counts measure just the fraction of those refugees who are officially registered with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and, as such, fail to gauge their overall prevalence in the population.
6. One example of such a forum is MicroMentor, a non-profit online initiative that offers free guidance to many young entrepreneurs and connects them with business mentors at www.micromentor.org

REFERENCES

Akpomujere, O., 2017. Contemporary Issues in Diversification of Nigerian Economy through Entrepreneurship. J. Technol. Manag. Bus. 4, 40–49.

Almeida, R., Behrman, J., Robalino, D. (Eds.), 2012. The Right Skills for the Job? Rethinking Training Policies for Workers. The World Bank, Washington, D.C. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8714-6

Arai, Y., 2010. Promoting job creation for young people in multinational enterprises: youth employment in Liberia.

Association for the Development of Education in Africa, n.d. National Policy Dialogue on Education for Youth Skills Development Monrovia.

Avsar, N.A., Piovani, C., 2019. Making trade policies gender-responsive: Data requirements, methodological developments and challenges. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), Geneva.

Bacchetta, M., Gregg, C., Rubinova, S., Klok, B.T., 2017. Investing in Skills for Inclusive Trade. World Trade Organization, Geneva.

Barro, R.J., 1991. Economic growth in a cross section of countries. Q. J. Econ. 106, 407–443.

Bloom, N., Van Reenen, J., 2010. Why Do Management Practices Differ across Firms and Countries? J. Econ. Perspect. 24, 203–224. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.1.203

Blundell, R., Dearden, L., Meghir, C., Sianesi, B., 1999. Human Capital Investment: The Returns from Education and Training to the Individual, the Firm and the Economy. Fisc. Stud. 20, 1–23.

Business 20, 2015. B20 SMEs & Entrepreneurship Taskforce Policy Paper. The Business 20 (B20), Turkey.

Cadot, O., Carrere, C., Strauss-Kahn, V., 2011. Export diversification: What's behind the hump? Rev. Econ. Stat. 93, 590–605.

CEDEFOP, 2010. The skill matching challenge: analysing skill mismatch and policy implications. European centre for the Development of Vocational Training, Luxembourg.

Coward, C., Caicedo, S., Ruach, H., Vega, N.R., 2014. Digital opportunities: innovative ICT solutions for youth employment. International Telecommunications Union. ITU.

Decent Jobs for Youth, n.d. Youth Entrepreneurship & Self-Employment: Unleashing the Potential of Youth to Succeed in Business and to Access Decent Work.

Draper, P., 2017. Trade, Inclusiveness, Inequality and the WTO (Discussion Paper). Global Economic Governance Africa.

Evald, M.R., Klyver, K., Christensen, P.R., 2011. The effect of human capital, social capital, and perceptual values on nascent entrepreneurs' export intentions. J. Int. Entrep. 9, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-010-0069-3

EY, 2016. Beyond disruption: Policy action to grow digital entrepreneurship.

Fernando, M., 2018. Creating opportunities for and with youth. Int. Trade Forum 14–15.

Field, E., Jayachandran, S., Pande, R., Rigol, N., 2015. Friendship at work: Can peer effects catalyze female entrepreneurship? (No. w21093). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Green, A., Martinez-Solano, L.E., 2011. Leveraging Training - Skills Development in SMEs: An Analysis of the West Midlands, England, UK. OECD, Paris.

Gupta, M.D., Engelman, R., Levy, J., Luchsinger, G., Merrick, T., Rosen, J.E., 2014. The Power of 1.8 Billion: Adolescents, Youth and the transformation of the future. The State of World Population 2014. UNFPA.

Hambrick, D.C., Mason, P.A., 1984. Upper Echelons: The Organization as a Reflection of Its Top Managers. Acad. Manage. Rev. 9, 193–206. https://doi.org/10.2307/258434

ILO, 2017. Global Employment Trends for Youth 2017 – Paths to a better working future. International Labour Organization, Geneva.

ILO, 2012. Global Employment Trends 2012. International Labour Office, Geneva.

ILO, 2010. Global employment trends: January 2010. International Labour Office, Geneva.

ILO/ECA, 2009. Report on Youth Employment Opportunities in Africa: The Impact of Young Women's Vulnerabilities on Opportunities to become an Entrepreneur A case of Ethiopia.

ITC, 2019a. Youth and Trade Programme Flyer.

ITC, 2019b. SME Competitiveness Outlook 2019: Big Money for Small Business – Financing the Sustainable Development Goals. International Trade Centre, Geneva.

ITC, 2019c. Stratégie sur l'intégration et l'employabilité des jeunes dans le secteur textile et habillement Tunisienne. ITC.

ITC, 2018a. Promoting SME Competitiveness in Africa: Data for de-risking investment.

ITC, 2018b. SME Competitiveness Outlook 2018: Business ecosystem for the digital age. International Trade Centre.

ITC, 2018c. Strategic Youth and Trade Development Roadmap of the Gambia (2018–2022).

ITC, 2018d. Youth and Trade Roadmap: Creating economic opportunties for youth in value chains.

ITC, 2017a. SME Competitiveness Outlook 2017 - The region: A door to global trade. International Trade Centre, Geneva, Switzerland.

ITC, 2017b. SheTrades: Promoting SME Competitiveness in Indonesia. International Trade Centre, Geneva.

ITC, 2016. SME Competitiveness Outlook 2016: Meeting the Standard for Trade. International Trade Centre, Geneva, Switzerland.

ITC, 2015a. SME Competitiveness Outlook 2015: Connect, Compete and Change for Inclusive Growth. International Trade Centre, Geneva.

ITC, 2015b. Unlocking Markets for Women to Trade. International Trade Centre, Geneva.

Jansen, M., Lanz, R., 2013. Skills and export competitiveness for small and medium-sized enterprises. World trade Organization, Geneva.

Joel, A.D., Jonah, C.T., Boma, A.K., 2017. Leveraging entrepreneurship development for Nigeria economic diversification: the role of selected government agencies. Adv. Res. J. Multidiscip. Discov. 16, 24–29.

Kew, J., Herrington, M., Litovsky, Y., Gale, H., 2013. Generation Entrepreneur? The state of global youth entrepreneurship. Youth Business International and Global Entrepreneurship Monitor.

Khokhar, T., n.d. Chart: How Is the World's Youth Population Changing? Data Blog. URL https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/chart-how-worlds-youth-population-changing

Kubisz, M., 2011. Leveraging Training - Skills Development in SMEs: An Analysis of Zaglebie Sub-Region, Poland, Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED) Working Paper 2011-06. OECD, Paris.

Kuruvilla, S., Erickson, C.L., Hwang, A., 2002. An Assessment of the Singapore Skills Development System: Does it Constitute a Viable Model for Other Developing Countries? World Dev. 30, 1461–1476. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(02)00046-3

Lawson, B., Samson, D., 2001. Developing Innovation Capability in Organisations: A Dynamic Capabilities Approach. Int. J. Innov. Manag. 05, 377–400. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919601000427

McPherson, T., 2008. Digital Youth, Innovation, and the unexpected. MIT Press, USA.

Middlesex University and Youth Business International, 2016. Exploring the impact of voluntary mentoring on young entrepreneurs. Youth Business International.

Miller, S.M., Upadhyay, M.P., 2000. The effects of openness, trade orientation, and human capital on total factor productivity. J. Dev. Econ. 63, 399–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3878(00)00112-7

Minniti, M., Naudé, W., 2010a. Special Section: Female Entrepreneurship across Countries and in Development. Eur. J. Dev. Res. 22.

Minniti, M., Naudé, W., 2010b. Female Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries. WIDERAngle. URL https://www.wider.unu.edu/publication/female-entrepreneurship-developing-countries

Morrison, A., Raju, D., Sinha, N., 2007. Gender Equality, Poverty and Economic Growth.

Multilateral Investment Fund, 2012. Give Youth a Chance: an Agenda for Action. Multilateral Investment Fund.

Murphy, R., 2000. Return migrant entrepreneurs and economic diversification in two counties in south Jiangxi, China. J. Int. Dev. 11, 661–672.

Neely, A., Adams, C., Crowe, P., 2001. The performance prism in practice. Meas. Bus. Excell. 5, 6–13. https://doi.org/10.1108/13683040110385142

OECD, 2018. SME and Entrepeneurship Policy in Kazakhstan 2018. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.

OECD (Ed.), 2015. In it together: why less inequality benefits all. OECD, Paris.

OECD, 2014. Supporting Youth in Entrepreneurship: Summary report of a policy development seminar organised by the OECD and the European Commission, Brussels, 22nd-23rd September 2014. OECD, Paris.

O'Higgins, N., 2017. Rising to the youth employment challenge: new evidence on key policy issues. International Labour Organization (ILO).

Onkelinx, J., Manolova, T.S., Edelman, L.F., 2015. Human Capital and SME Internationalization: Empirical Evidence from Belgium. Int. Small Bus. J. 34, 818–837.

Otsuka, K., Sonobe, T., 2011. A cluster-based industrial development policy for low-income countries.

Pikoko, V., Phiri, A., 2018. Vuyokazi Pikoko and Andrew Phiri. 2018. "Is there hysteresis in South African unemployment= Evidence from the post-recessionary period". Munich University Working Paper.

Purfield, C., Finger, H., Ongley, K., Baduel, B., Castellanos, C., Pierre, G., Stepanyan, V., Roos, E., 2018. Opportunity for All: Promoting Growth and Inclusiveness in the Middle East and North Africa (IMF Departmental Paper No. 18/11). International Monetary Fund, Washington D.C.

Schoof, U., 2006. Stimulating Youth Entrepreneurship: Barriers and Incentives to Enterprise Start-Ups by Young People. International Labour Office.

Schott, T., Kew, P., Cheraghi, M., 2015. Future Potential: a GEM perspective on youth entrepreneurship. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor.

Sibanda, S., Sibanda, T., 2016. Financial Education in South Africa: Overview of key initiatives and actors. ILO, Geneva.

Solomon, D., 2010. Desk Review of Studies Conducted on Women Entrepreneurs in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa Chamber of Commerce.

Sonobe, T., Otsuka, K., 2006. Cluster-Based Industrial Development : An East Asian Model.

Stuart, T.E., Sorenson, O., 2005. Social Networks and Entrepreneurship, in: Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research: Disciplinary Perspectives. Springer, New York, pp. 233–252.

Syverson, C., 2011. What Determines Productivity? J. Econ. Lit. 49, 326–365. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.49.2.326

The Mastercard Foundation, 2015. Youth at Work: Building Economic Opportunities for Young People in Africa. The Mastercard Foundation.

Tripney, J., Hombrados, J., Newman, M., Hovish, K., Brown, C., Steinka-Fry, K., Wilkey, E., 2013. Technical and vocational education and training (TVET) interventions to improve the employability and employment of young people in low- and middle-income countries: a Systematic Review, Campbell Systematic Reviews 2013:9. The Campbell Collaboration. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2013.9

UNCTAD, 2014. Empowering Women Entrepreneurs through Information and Communications Technologies. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Geneva.

UNESA, 2015. Population Facts.

UN-ESCAP, 2012. Policy guidebook for SME development in Asia and the Pacific. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok.

Vandenberg, P., Trinh, L.Q., 2016. Small Firms, Human Capital, and Productivity in Asia, Working Paper 582. Asian Development Bank Institute.

Weidenkaff, F., 2018. Scaling up action on youth employment with the Global Goals. Int. Trade Forum 2, 26–27.

Winters, L.A., Martuscelli, A., 2014. Trade Liberalisation and Poverty: What Have we Learned in a Decade?, in: Working Paper 9947. Presented at the Centre for Economic Policy Research.

Woessmann, L., 2011. Education policies to make globalization more inclusive, in: Making Globalization Socially Sustainable. World Trade Organization and International Labour Office, pp. 297–316.

World Bank, 2012. World Development Report 2013: Jobs. World Bank, Washington D.C.

World Bank, 2011. World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development. World Bank, Washington D.C.

World Economic Forum, 2017. Accelerating Workforce Reskilling for the Fourth Industrial Revolution: An Agenda for Leaders to Shape the Future of Education, Gender and Work.

World Economic Forum, 2014. Matching Skills and Labour Market Needs.

World Trade Organization, 2016. World Trade Report 2016: Leveling the trading field for SMEs. World Trade Organization, Geneva.

WTO, 2019. World Trade Outlook Indicator 2019. World Trade Outlook Indic.

Yifu Lin, J., 2012. Youth Bulge: A Demographic Dividend or a Demographic Bomb in Developing Countries? Lets Talk Dev. URL http://blogs.worldbank.org/developmenttalk/youth-bulge-a-demographic-dividend-or-a-demographic-bomb-in-developing-countries

Yoshino, Y., 2011. Industrial Clusters and Micro and Small Enterprises in Africa: From Survival to Growth. (No. 58850), Directions in Development. World Bank, Washington D.C.

CHAPTER 9

EMERGING LESSONS FROM AID FOR TRADE IN SUPPORT OF WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT

Contributed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

Abstract: *This chapter examines how donors are taking into account gender perspectives in aid for trade, as women's economic empowerment is one of the key drivers of sustainable development. It introduces data showing that donors have been increasing gender-responsive aid for trade. At the same time, there is scope for improvement, particularly in sectors such as transport, energy, finance and business, mining and industry, where the proportion of gender-responsive aid is low. Good examples by a few donors are therefore highlighted to provide lessons to others that are facing challenges in taking account of gender perspectives in these areas. They reveal that many projects entail training of women as government officials or as project beneficiaries, particularly for income generation. Other activities include studies or development of project designs that are gender-responsive in the particular area. Given the Joint Declaration on Trade and Women's Economic Empowerment, donors need to build the evidence base, establish an adequate monitoring and evaluation system, and ensure accountability towards women's economic empowerment.*

CONTEXT

Women's economic empowerment has been recognised as one of the key drivers of sustainable development and gender equality (Ferrant 2011; Cuberes, Teigner 2016; Gonzalez et al 2015; Ostry et al 2014; World Bank 2012; Knowles et al 2002). Studies indicate that if women have more control over household resources, it leads to greater investment in health and education. Furthermore, it results in higher and more sustainable levels of growth. In this respect, while the Beijing Platform for Action in 1995 promoted women's economic empowerment, it encouraged progress in developed and developing countries alike (see Box 9.1). On the other hand, Millennium Development Goals (MDG) 3 that targeted "gender equality and empower women", was mainly about developing countries and focused on education, particularly to increase the primary school enrolment rates for girls.

Partially as a reaction to the limited scope of MDG 3, as well as the development community's increased understanding of the positive impact of women's economic empowerment on development outcomes, the 2030 Agenda's Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 5 expands the scope to "achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls" (Mason, King 2001; Morrison et al 2007; World Bank 2012; UN 2015; WEF 2015). For example, it raises the need to, *inter alia,* give women land ownership and access to financial services, enhance their use of information and communications technology (ICT), address unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of infrastructure, and strengthen policies and legislation to promote gender equality and women's empowerment. Other targets that address women's empowerment includes SDG 8 on Decent Work and Economic Growth, which refers to productive employment, decent work for women, and sex-disaggregated data.

Box 9.1. Beijing Platform for Action 1995 "Women in the Economy"

The Beijing Platform for Action 1995 included "Women in the Economy" which commits states to:

- Promote women's economic rights and independence, including access to employment, appropriate working conditions and control over economic resources. Example: "*Enact and enforce legislation to guarantee the rights of women and men to equal pay for equal work or work of equal value*".
- Facilitate women's equal access to resources, employment, markets and trade. Example: "*Pay special attention to women's needs when disseminating market, trade and resource information and provide appropriate training in these fields*".
- Provide business services, training and access to markets, information and technology, particularly to low-income women. Example: "*Create non-discriminatory support services, including investment funds for women's businesses, and target women, particularly low-income women, in trade promotion programmes*"
- Strengthen women's economic capacity and commercial networks. Example: "*Provide business services, including marketing and trade information, product design and innovation, technology transfer and quality, to women's business enterprises, including those in export sectors of the economy*".
- Eliminate occupational segregation and all forms of employment discrimination. Example: "*Increase efforts to close the gap between women's and men's pay, take steps to implement the principle of equal remuneration for equal work of equal value by strengthening legislation, including compliance with international labour laws and standards, and encourage job evaluation schemes with gender-neutral criteria.*"
- Promote harmonisation of work and family responsibilities for women and men. Example "*Improve the development of, and access to, technologies that facilitate occupational as well as domestic work, encourage self- support, generate income, transform gender-prescribed roles within the productive process and enable women to move out of low-paying jobs*".

Source: Adapted from Beijing Platform for Action (1995) http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/economy.htm

More recently in 2016, the High-Level Panel on Women's Economic Empowerment, convened by the UN Secretary-General, laid out measures to accelerate women's economic empowerment, recognising it as a cornerstone of the SDGs and critical to achieving gender equality (UN Women 2018). They include, *inter alia*: sharing the burden of unpaid care work; ensuring women's access to financial services, new technology, and justice; changing practices in employment; and ratifying key international agreements on the rights of women workers, especially in the informal sector and domestic work.

Despite these global commitments, however, women continue to face barriers to participate in the paid economy, leading to poorer outcomes than men across many key economic indicators. Particularly in developing countries, women still account for a large part of vulnerable and informal employment (ILO 2018). They often have less access to land, finance, agricultural machinery and production technologies than men, contributing to gender gaps in income and productivity (Palacios-López, Ramón López 2015; Asian Development Bank 2018; World Bank 2015a and 2015b; Sahay 2018; ILO 2016). Women working in the informal sector can face even more challenges, for instance, in access to loans from formal financial institutions (Osondu et al 2015; Kasseeah, Tandrayen-Ragoobur, 2015). Furthermore, women are responsible for a significant share of unpaid care and domestic work, which includes time-consuming tasks such as fetching water and labour intensive cooking, leaving them less time to engage in paid activities, training and education (OECD 2019a). Women are also concentrated in lower paid sectors (UN 2016).

Closing these gender gaps could lead to poverty reduction and other positive returns for women, their families and communities, for example, by increasing agricultural outputs and improving female and child health and education outcomes (World Bank 2012, 2015a). Investments in infrastructure in particular can support women's involvement in paid activities by facilitating movement with improved and safe transportation, or freeing up time spent on unpaid activities such as collecting fuel when modern energy sources are made available (World Bank 2012).

In this context, trade can potentially bring benefits to women. For example, aside from increased income, new jobs for women in the manufacturing sector had positive effects on women's bargaining power within households. In particular, export oriented textile and clothing production provided greater independence and enhanced decision-making power over the distribution of household resources for many women (Korinek 2005). Similarly, the arrival of the garment industry, where women are often over-represented, had positive spill-overs in other areas such as education, i.e., increasing the likelihood of girls attending school (Heath, Mobarak 2015). Agro-food value chains can also benefit women if businesses pay attention to gender issues in enforcing labour standards and when they are given access to labour saving technology and trainings to improve their skills (IFC 2016; FAO, ILO, IFAD 2010; World Bank, Government of Liberia 2010). Other studies show that trade expansion can reduce gender inequality if an appropriate mix and sequence of trade and other economic policies is implemented (Elson et al 2007).

At the same time, as women are not a homogeneous group, the impacts of trade differ on women, depending on their, *inter alia*, location, socio-economic status, education level, and disability. Therefore, as the Beijing Platform for Action underlined[1], special attention needs to be paid to possible unintended negative impacts of trade liberalisation on certain groups of women. For example, poor quality jobs for low skilled workers in unsafe environments may affect women negatively, including by increasing their exposure to violence. This can be exacerbated by the pressure of international competition (UN Women 2015). Increased imports due to trade liberalisation in agriculture can be a detriment to women who work in small-scale farming. For some higher skilled export industries, men's employment may rise more where there are significant gender gaps in education (Korinek 2005). Even where trade opens employment opportunities for women, their total workload may increase if the time needed for their unpaid care and domestic work remains the same (Çagatay 2001). In some countries, discriminatory laws and social norms curtail women's access to finance, new technology, and knowledge on marketing – making it difficult to take full advantage of the new opportunities created by trade liberalisation (World Bank 2018).

In this respect, aid for trade can enhance economic opportunities for women to participate in export and import activities, such as micro, small and medium sized enterprises (MSMEs), and thereby contribute to their economic empowerment[2] (Kimm Gnangnon 2019). Aid for trade can also address impediments to trade, such as lack of infrastructure, and prevent women from being negatively impacted from export activities, including poor labour conditions and low wages (ILO 2017). Particularly since the establishment of the WTO Task Force on Aid for Trade in 2006, there has been an acknowledgement of the need to take into account the "gender perspective" and of the overall goal of sustainable development. Thus taking account of the gender perspective was established as one of the guiding principles of the Task Force (WTO Task Force on Aid for Trade 2006).

Furthermore, in 2017, a Joint Declaration on Trade and Women's Economic Empowerment, adopted in the margin of the Buenos Aires WTO Ministerial Conference, acknowledged that "inclusive trade policies can contribute to advancing gender equality and women's economic empowerment". The declaration listed a number of recommendations[3], which includes the need to ensure that aid for trade supports tools and knowledge for analysing, designing and implementing more gender-responsive trade policies. The Task Force is required to report to the WTO on progress in implementing the recommendations of the Joint Declaration in 2020.


ASSESSING INCORPORATION OF GENDER PERSPECTIVES IN AID FOR TRADE

Views on the importance of gender dimensions in aid for trade

In this context, the Aid for Trade Initiative's bi-annual Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) exercises from 2011 to 2019 have been taking stock of gender dimensions, including the integration of gender perspectives and women's economic empowerment by donors and partner countries. The M&E 2019 shows that the majority of donors that responded considered women's economic empowerment in aid for trade as a priority. At the same time, Korea, Latvia and Portugal were unsure and Czech Republic, France and Hungary did not consider it as a priority (OECD-WTO 2019). Furthermore, the M&E 2011 showed that most donors considered greater gender equality as an "important" objective in aid for trade, although Norway was the only donor that responded that it was the "most important" objective. At the same time, greater gender equality was the penultimate lowest in terms of importance among several objectives (see Figure 9.1). As for partner countries, among those that responded, the M&E 2011[4] showed that greater gender equality was the least important among the goals that they wanted to achieve through aid for trade – lower than greater environmental sustainability, reduced poverty, increased economic growth, and export diversification (OECD-WTO 2011).

Moreover, the M&E 2017 reflected that only 48% of responded donors considered that aid for trade will contribute to SDG 5 on gender equality and women's empowerment (See figure 9.2) (OECD-WTO 2017). Although this was higher than SDG 13 on climate action, it was much lower than SDG 10 on reduced inequalities, SDG 8 on decent work and economic growth, and SDG 9 on industry, innovation and infrastructure. On the other hand, donors' expectation of aid for trade to contribute to SDG 5 was still higher than that of the partner countries at 38%. This is despite developing countries acknowledging in the Buenos Aires Declaration that, recalling the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, inclusive trade policies can contribute to advancing gender equality and women's economic empowerment, which has a positive impact on economic growth and poverty reduction. Furthermore, there are some developing countries that are making important efforts to support women's economic empowerment[5].

Figure 9.1. Main goals donors and partner countries want to achieve through aid for trade




Source: OECD-WTO (2011), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2011 (questionnaires)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953964

The M&E exercises might be reflecting the views of the civil servants who responded to the questionnaires without necessarily representing a consolidated view of the government. The lower priority and expectations by partner countries could be based on their limited perception of women as economic agents and the unawareness of potential positive impacts of aid for trade for women, due perhaps to their gender bias, as well as the lack of communication or insufficient presentation of evidence on the part of donors. Thus the donor community could face a challenge in promoting women's economic empowerment as they work to align their investments with partner countries' priorities, as called for in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and Busan Partnership Agreement (2011) and implemented by the Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation.

Figure 9.2. Views on aid-for-trade contribution to the SDGs



Source: OECD-WTO (2017), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2017 (questionnaires)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933953983

BOX 9.2. The Gender Marker

The OECD tracks aid in support of gender equality and women's rights using DAC Gender Marker – a qualitative statistical tool to record aid activities that target gender equality as a policy objective. It is based on a three-point scoring system:

Principal (Score 2) means that gender equality is the main objective of the project and is fundamental in its design and expected results. The project would not have been undertaken without this objective.

Significant (Score 1) means that gender equality is an important and deliberate objective, but not the principal reason for undertaking the project. The gender equality objective must be explicit in the project documentation and cannot be implicit or assumed. The project, in addition to other objectives, is designed to have a positive impact on advancing gender equality or the empowerment of women. Minimum criteria are:

- Gender analysis of the project has been conducted.
- Findings from this gender analysis have informed the design of the project.
- Presence of at least one explicit gender equality objective backed by at least one gender-specific indicator.
- Data and indicators are disaggregated by sex where applicable.
- Commitment to monitor and report on the gender equality results achieved by the project in the evaluation phase.

Not targeted (Score 0) means that the project has been screened against the Gender Marker but has not been found to target gender equality.

In this report, the term "gender marked aid" refers to Official Development Finance (Official Development Assistance (ODA) and Other Official Flows) scored either 1 (significant) or 2 (principal). The Gender Marker is used here as a proxy to examine the sectors where donors are taking into account gender perspectives in adhering to the guiding principle by the Task Force on Aid for Trade mentioned above. In this context, the Gender Marker is mostly used as a tool to filter projects instead of analysing the quantity *per se*, particularly as the DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET)[8] has recently carried out a study on amounts of aid to support women's economic empowerment (OECD 2018)[9]. Furthermore, this chapter focuses on women's economic empowerment, in accordance with the theme of the 2019 Aid for Trade Review, rather than assessing donor efforts to reduce and measure gender inequality, although the latter is strongly related to women's economic empowerment and is key to sustainable development.

Given the relatively low levels of aid to gender equality in aid for trade and even lower levels of dedicated funding (Score 2) (1% in 2016-17), the GENDERNET encourages donors to increase dedicated funding for gender equality and women's empowerment, particularly in the aid for trade sectors where it has remained consistently low. Increasing investments in these areas will be essential to achieving SDG 5, particularly Target 5.4 which focuses on unpaid care and domestic work through the provision of public services and infrastructure, and Goal 8 which promotes women's productive employment. This is backed by growing evidence from donors on the limits of gender mainstreaming to address the underlying power imbalances that drive gender equality and curtail women's empowerment. For example, a recent review of Switzerland found that gender specific projects were 73% effective in promoting gender equality while projects that included gender as a cross-cutting theme were only 31% effective (FDFA of Switzerland 2018). Thus, gender mainstreaming should be combined with other efforts to address gender-based discrimination and inequality, such as challenging discriminatory social norms, including engaging with men and boys to address power imbalances that can hold back women's economic empowerment.

The Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker provides more information on how members should apply the Gender Marker. The OECD is working with donors to ensure consistent reporting and comparability.


Source: Adapted from FDFA of Switzerland (2018), OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality (2016)

Trends in incorporating gender perspectives in aid for trade

In view of the above results from the M&E exercises, bilateral and multilateral donors have nevertheless steadily increased gender-responsive aid for trade, as measured by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Gender Equality Policy Marker (Gender Marker) (see Box 9.2 and Figure 9.3). Based on the data, total amount of commitments[6] in aid for trade that have been marked with the Gender Marker – both as a Significant Objective and Principal Objective – rose from USD 3 billion per year on average in 2006-07 to USD 12 billion per year in 2016-17. In particular, there was a rapid surge in gender marked amounts in aid for trade between 2012-13 and 2014-15, mostly due to Japan's eightfold increase in gender-responsive aid for trade, especially in sectors like transport. This is significant progress since, for many years, bilateral and multilateral donors were more likely to integrate gender equality and women's empowerment in the social sectors[7].

Moreover, the increase applied not only to the absolute volume, but also to the proportion of aid for trade that was gender-responsive, which grew from 9% on average in 2006-07 to 24% on average in 2016-17. The aggregate growth was due to the increase of proportions in practically every donor's aid for trade, which was in line with the overall rising trend of gender marking by DAC members in total aid – including sectors that are not considered aid for trade, such as health and education. Notably, aside from Japan, Finland steadily increased its share of gender marked aid for trade from 12% in 2012-13 to 43% in 2016-17, as did Ireland from 47% to 86%.

Figure 9.3. Trends in Gender Marked Aid for Trade (USD billion, 2016 constant)



Note: ODA and Other Official Flows. Only DAC members due to data availability

Source: OECD-DAC: aid activity database (2019)


StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933954002

In the Aid for Trade Initiative, relevant sectors are grouped into three major categories: Trade Policy, Economic Infrastructure, and Productive Capacity[10]. The distribution of gender marked aid for trade in the three categories remained the same over the decade, with the most going to Productive Capacity, and the least going to Trade Policy. However, Economic Infrastructure rose seven times – predominantly due to Japan's increase – and Productive Capacity rose three times, while Trade Policy only doubled in ten years. The share of gender marked Trade Policy among the three categories is small as most projects are usually lower cost technical assistance. In contrast, Economic Infrastructure – which includes transport, energy, and communications – tends to have high hardware costs. Productive Capacity includes a wide range of sectors from agriculture, fisheries, mining, industry, finance and business.

Distribution of incorporating gender perspectives in aid for trade

Despite the growing trend of gender marked aid for trade, donor implementation of their agreement to take full account of gender perspectives in aid for trade remains low. As mentioned above, while the amount of gender marked aid for trade increased during the last decade, it still accounted for only 24% of total aid-for-trade commitments in 2016-17. In other words, 76% of aid for trade was not gender-responsive, i.e., 56% was not targeted and 20% was not screened. In terms of volume and disaggregated by sectors, the highest amount of gender marked aid-for-trade sector in 2016-17 was agriculture (around USD 5.5 billion, see Figure 9.4.). This was followed by transport at USD 5 billion and energy at USD 3 billion.

Figure 9.4. Sector breakdown of gender marked aid for trade 2016-17 (USD billion, 2016 constant)



Note: DAC Members, AsDB, EBRD, IADB, World Bank, ILO, and UNDP.


Source: OECD-DAC: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933954021

As for the proportion of gender marked aid out of the total aid committed to the respective sectors, agriculture also had the highest at around 47% in 2016-17 (see Figure 9.5). This was followed by trade policies at 25% and transport at 20%. Trade policies can be somewhat higher in proportion compared to other sectors because activities frequently involve trainings for partner governments that entail participation of female officials. Many studies were also carried out on trade and transport policies that addressed gender dimensions in the respective areas. In transport – mainly road – many projects consisted of involving women as stakeholders in the planning or as labourers in the construction.

On the other hand, although having relatively high total amounts of gender marked commitments, in terms of proportions, only 14% of energy was gender marked. Absolute amount and proportion of gender marked commitments were also low in communications[11]. Therefore, the small proportions of gender marked amounts in many of these aid-for-trade sectors show scope for improvement. However, in analysing the size of projects, results indicate that those that incorporated gender perspectives in sectors such as energy, mining, industry, finance and business were on average smaller in scale (i.e., had lower amounts) than projects in the same sectors that did not incorporate gender perspectives[12]. Therefore, future studies could explore whether smaller projects tend to target women as opposed to larger projects that have a wider beneficiary coverage. Moreover, studies could investigate how larger projects can be more gender-responsive to ensure that they are not having adverse effects on women and to identify entry points to promote women's economic empowerment.

Figure 9.5. Sector breakdown of Gender Marked aid for trade in proportion 2016-17



Note: DAC Members, AsDB, EBRD, IADB, World Bank, ILO, and UNDP.

Source: OECD-DAC: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933954040

Further disaggregation shows the specific areas in which donors were actively taking account of gender perspectives within each sector. For example, they were mostly in agrarian reform, agricultural co-operatives, and agricultural extension, cottage industries, handicrafts, SMEs, microfinance, and tourism where women are often already working informally. These areas may have relatively high levels of support to women's economic empowerment as donors can target women as beneficiaries. For instance, microfinance is often used by donors to focus on women working in the informal sector who cannot have access to loans or savings mechanism in formal finance institutions.

Case Stories collected for the Aid for Trade Initiative described many projects, such as the ones carried out by the International Trade Centre (ITC), aiming at connecting women to export markets and value chains, including through e-commerce (OECD-WTO 2011, 2017). For example, companies became intermediaries with artisan groups – such as women tailors – to facilitate access to markets. Another project of ITC provided training to rural women in digital marketing skills using mobile phones. On the other hand, areas such as energy and communications where gender marked aid is low are often believed to be "gender neutral", thus not requiring a gender perspective to be applied. This is despite evidence that improving women's access to reliable and affordable energy can, for example, reduce their unpaid workload, thereby freeing up more time for paid work activities (World Bank 2012).

The M&E 2019 showed that, when asked to select specific areas where aid for trade best support women's economic empowerment, donors and partner countries converged around similar sectors. A high proportion selected trade education and training, agriculture, business, banking, and trade policy/facilitation (See Figure 9.6). In particular, several partner countries mentioned more precise areas where they considered that aid for trade could contribute to the economic empowerment of women (Box 9.3). On the other hand, not many donors and partner countries selected forestry, mineral resources, regional trade agreements, energy, and communications as best areas in supporting women's economic empowerment.

Box 9.3. In my view

Some partner countries consider that aid for trade can contribute to women's economic empowerment in the following areas:

Cape Verde


- learning about in import/export terms and procedures;
- boosting digital and ICT skills;
- enhancing foreign language skills oriented for global trade; and
- upgrading water supply infrastructure.

Mauritius

- developing a coherent framework to boost the productive capacity of MSMEs; and
- mentoring and advisory programmes to connect MSMEs to untapped and potential markets at the international level.

Source: Adapted from OECD-WTO (2019), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2019 (questionnaires)

Figure 9.6. Areas of aid for trade that donors and partner countries believe can best support women's economic empowerment




Source: OECD-WTO (2019), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2019 (questionnaires)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933954059

In terms of country income levels, gender marked aid for trade was allocated to lower middle income countries (LMICs), least developed countries (LDCs), and then upper middle income countries (UMICs), in that order in 2016-2017 (see Figure 9.7). However, LDCs received proportionally more gender marked aid for trade compared to their total share of aid for trade, while UMICs received proportionally less. This is because LDCs had a relatively high share of agriculture – the sector with the largest proportion of gender marked aid for trade – whereas UMICs had a relatively high share of infrastructure (transport and energy) which is generally low in gender marking. This is also reflected in the regional distribution[13] where Africa received proportionally more gender marked aid for trade than its total share of aid for trade, while Latin America and Europe received less, due to the high amounts of agricultural projects in the former and infrastructure, finance and business projects in the latter two regions.

Figure 9.7. Distribution of Income-groups and regions of gender marked ODF 2016-2017




Note: DAC Members, AsDB, EBRD, IADB, World Bank, ILO, and UNDP.

Source: OECD-DAC: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933954078

Figure 9.8. Average share of gender focused aid for trade per year 2016-2017



Note: DAC members only

Source: OECD-DAC: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933954097

Box 9.4. Women's economic empowerment in "Aid for Trade" by Australia and EU

Australia

Economic empowerment of women is included as a priority in the 2015 'Strategy for Australia's Aid for Trade Investments'. The Strategy states that empowerment of women should be incorporated in every investment, as aid for trade can help women to participate fully and effectively in goods trades in sectors such as agriculture and fisheries, as well as in services. Australia's 2016 'Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy' also prioritises women's economic empowerment and specifies areas of support where aid for trade can benefit women. These strategies focus on:

- *improving wages, working conditions and safety, as well as removing discrimination in sectors where women workers and traders predominate*
- *business and vocational skills, particularly for those who are disadvantaged*
- *global value chains*
- *addressing barriers faced by women entrepreneurs, including access to finance*
- *resources and innovations to improve agricultural productivity and income*
- *women's advancement in the private sector*
- *business and legal environment for women entrepreneurs*
- *infrastructure investments to support women's access to economic opportunities and trade*

EU

The *2007 Joint EU Strategy on Aid for Trade* places specific focus on women's economic empowerment. In 2017, the EU expanded its coverage, particularly to support women's access to decent work, financial services, land, and entrepreneurship. The strategy states the need for:

- *inclusion of gender issues in needs assessments for trade, particularly by supporting active involvement of relevant community-based organisations*
- *involvement of small and medium enterprise associations, small-scale farmers and women's groups in designing and implementing aid for trade programmes*
- *development of qualitative and quantitative indicators on gender for monitoring and evaluation*
- *links to finance, advisory services, women's business networks and digital technology*
- *systematic gender analysis of every aid for trade project*

In its first monitoring report issued in December 2018, the EU illustrates many good practices that incorporated gender dimensions in aid for trade by the EU institutions and member states with positive outcomes on women's economic empowerment. On the other hand, the report also highlights the remaining gaps in addressing gender dimensions in aid for trade projects. For example, only 38% of 68 EU delegations stated that aid for trade projects were systematically subject to gender analyses and promotion of women's economic empowerment.

Sources: Adapted from DFAT of Australia (2015, 2016, 2017), European Union (2007, 2017, 2018)

Concerning gender-responsive aid for trade by bilateral donors in 2016-17, the largest ones in absolute amounts were Japan, EU institutions, Germany, the United States and the United Kingdom, who are also large donors in aid for trade. However, Figure 9.8. shows that Ireland had the highest proportion, with almost 90% of its aid for trade being gender-responsive, followed by Canada, Spain, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. Moreover, Spain, Sweden, Australia and the United States had relatively high proportions of aid for trade focused on gender equality and women's empowerment as a Principal Objective. Of the donors with high proportions, Ireland and Canada had strong focus on agriculture, which is a sector that has higher levels of gender marked aid overall.

On the other hand, Hungary, Korea, Poland, Norway, Portugal, France, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Austria, New Zealand and Italy had less than 20% of their respective aid for trade as gender marked. Some of these donors that are relatively new may not have prioritised or may not be familiar with approaches to gender-responsive projects, despite their strong focus on agriculture. France, Italy and Norway, which predominantly support the infrastructure sectors such as energy and transport, had lower levels of gender marked aid. This is the case despite the fact that, for example, France has a framework and indicators to measure progress towards taking account of gender perspectives across aid for trade sectors.

STRATEGIES AND GUIDELINES IN INCORPORATING GENDER PERSPECTIVES IN AID FOR TRADE


As aid for trade encompasses a wide range of sectors – i.e., from agriculture, transport, energy, to industry – there are only a few donors, such as Australia and the EU, that have a dedicated strategy on integrating gender perspectives in "aid for trade" comprehensively (see Box 9.4). Other donors have integrated gender perspectives or have made it a cross-cutting priority in their development co-operation related to trade. For example, Sweden's Policy Framework for Development Co-operation aims to ensure both men and women benefit from trade, one of its highest priority areas. Others have nevertheless established overall strategies or plans for action to support women's economic empowerment in thematic priorities such as: promotion of women's economic and social rights, engaging the private sector in contributing to women's economic empowerment, or increasing the participation of women in the labour force. These are implemented mainly in agriculture, rural development, SMEs, and access to finance.

For example, in the M&E 2019, Canada referred to its "Feminist International Assistance Policy" which promoted women and girls to develop their skills, have access to decision-making positions, and take part in economic growth of their communities, particularly through supporting technical and vocational training and entrepreneurship. In addition, there are some development finance institutions (DFIs) that try to target women in their support to the private sector. An example is the "2X Challenge" by the G7 DFIs which committed to mobilise USD 3 billion by 2020 to invest in women. In this context, they developed guidelines and criteria to apply a gender lens for projects to qualify (see Box 9.5).

Furthermore, a few donors have guidelines for gender-responsive aid in specific sectors such as agriculture, SMEs, microfinance, tourism, extractive industries, energy, transport and communications. These are New Zealand, Asian Development Bank (AsDB), African Development Bank (AfDB), Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), World Bank, United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO), United Nations Development Programme, and others (see Box 9.6). Many of these donors underline the need to, *inter alia*, collect sex-disaggregated data, carry out *ex ante* gender analysis, and conduct monitoring and evaluation on outputs and impact regarding women. In implementation, most donors state that they have a "twin-track approach" by mainstreaming gender equality across different sectors as well as by specifically targeting gender equality and women's empowerment in programming, following the DAC Guidelines for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (OECD DAC 1999).

Box 9.5. Applying a gender lens in supporting private investment by G7 Development Finance Institutions

The G7 DFIs launched the 2X Challenge at the 2018 G7 Summit in Charlevoix, Canada. The 2X Challenge commits the G7 DFIs to mobilize USD 3 billion with private sector partners to invest in women by providing loans, equity, guarantees, and political risk insurance. A project qualifies for the 2X Challenge if it meets at least one of the following 2X criteria:



The 2X Challenge is committed to transparency and accountability. Every transaction qualified in the 2X Challenge will be posted on the 2X Challenge website (www.2XChallenge.org) which includes qualification details, sector information and capital commitments.

Source: Adapted from OPIC (2018, 2019) and 2X Challenge website, https://www.2xchallenge.org/

At a more collective level, in 2004, GENDERNET developed a guide "Why Gender Matters in Infrastructure" for energy, transport, water, and sanitation (OECD DAC, 2004). It suggests general actions to take, such as: incorporating gender specific objectives into project design; using gender analysis and sex-disaggregated data to develop gender strategies throughout the project; involving women through consultation, participation and decision-making; and monitoring the gender objectives of the project.

More recently, the OECD, with participation of some GENDERNET members, developed guidance for donors and partner country governments[14] to support women's economic empowerment in, *inter alia*, infrastructure, with the specific aim of addressing women's disproportionate share of unpaid care and domestic work (OECD 2019a). It also states the need to include proper safeguarding measures to ensure women's safety in particular on large infrastructure projects, provide quality childcare provisions to allow women to engage in paid work, consider unpaid care work in gender assessments or diagnostics, and focus on closing gender gaps in employment in infrastructure sectors. Aside from the ones mentioned above, however, few donors have specific guidelines on how to take account of gender perspectives in several key aid-for-trade sectors such as transport, energy, communications, finance and business, or industry.

Box 9.6. Guidelines on trade, infrastructure, extractive Industries, and tourism

Guide on Gender Mainstreaming Trade Capacity-Building Projects by UNIDO, 2015

- Ensure that women and men benefit equally from trade capacity-building projects throughout the project formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages. This is carried out by gender analysis and identification of potential stakeholders and partners.
- Indicators for gender-sensitive trade capacity include: ratio of women's income to men's income in comparable value-chain segments; percentage of women in better paid positions across segments of the value chain; ratio of women to men enrolling in trade capacity-building training; and number of procurement contracts obtained as a result of women-owned business certification.

Gender Mainstreaming in Infrastructure by AfDB, 2009

- Design and input indicators: infrastructure constraints on women's economic, domestic and community management roles addressed.
- Implementation indicators: participatory project planning and implementation with women in communities.
- Output indicators: increase in number of women participated in project activities such as road construction and maintenance, increase proportion of women with access to employment and income generating activities.
- Impact indicators: increased number of women entrepreneurs on road sides.

Internal Toolkit on Gender Mainstreaming in Infrastructure Operations by IADB

IADB has an internal on-line toolkit for gender mainstreaming in infrastructure operations, which is in the process of being on an open website. It includes guides on integrating gender perspectives, with examples of baselines in project design, 150 gender-sensitive activities, and 600 output and outcome indicators.

Mainstreaming Gender in Extractive Industries by World Bank, 2009

- Performance indicators: legal ability of women to own and operate mines, pro-female banking and land ownership regulations, and gender sensitisation activities.
- Impact indicators: percentage of extractive industry company's community program spent on women's projects, number of women employed and the gender wage gap for the same job in the company.

Gender Equality in Tourism by New Zealand, 2016

- Ensure women's participation in consultations, governance, policy-making and local government planning on tourism; and building capacity of SMEs to engage women in consultations and decision-making.
- Support economic opportunities for women in the service sector, such as food catering, tour guiding, transport, accommodation, and food supply. Minimise stereotypical roles for women, such as cleaning, washing, and bed making.
- Promote scholarships and training in hospitality, marketing, recruitment, management as well as in financial services for women, such as insurance, banking, and loans.
- Ensure women are able to negotiate terms and conditions of employment, including working hours to reflect domestic and community commitments.

Sources: Adapted from AfDB (2009),World Bank (2009), MFAT of New Zealand (2012) and UNIDO (2015)

Examples of incorporating gender perspectives in aid-for-trade areas

This section provides some good examples[15] where donors are incorporating gender perspectives in different aid-for-trade sectors. They cover areas with relatively high levels of gender marked aid, such as agriculture, SMEs, tourism, and garments, as well as the areas that are relatively low, such as trade, infrastructure, finance and business, and industry. These examples could serve as lessons to donors that are facing challenges in similar areas. Most of the following projects were marked as Significant Objective (Score 1) as opposed to Principal Objective (Score 2) for gender equality and women's empowerment (See OECD DAC 2018 for the distribution).

Trade Policy

Sweden and **UNCTAD** developed the **Trade and Gender** Toolbox which provides a framework and methodology to assess the impact on women of **trade reforms**, such as the implementation of a preferential trade agreement. The methodology incorporates four components: the assessment of gender inequalities in the country's economic context; quantitative analysis of the expected consequences of the trade reform on the economy and women; gender-sensitive monitoring indicators; and a trade and gender index to synthesise the impact of trade openness on gender. This has been applied to the Economic Partnership Agreement between the EU and the East African Community to assess the impact of trade reforms on the different sectors for Kenyan women.

Australia and the **World Bank** are aiming to enhance women's economic opportunities and cross-border connectivity through the South Asia Regional Trade Facilitation Program (SARTFP), particularly in **Bangladesh, Bhutan, India and Nepal**. SARTFP stems from the recognition that women and men may be impacted in different ways by **trade facilitation**, thereby raising the need to collect sex-disaggregated data, as well as to carry out gender informed research, analysis, monitoring and evaluation in this area. SARTFP has led to the adoption of gender-sensitive trade facilitation policies by governments in areas such as cross-border markets, access to facilities, inland waterway transport and tourism policy.

Sweden also financed a study to analyse the gender impact of the prospective Association Agreement of **Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine** with the EU. The report highlights the potential negative impact due to import competition through the **preferential trade agreement** in areas where many women are employed, such as some agricultural sectors, food processing and manufacturing of electronic products. On the other hand, it points to opportunities in other areas for women, such as in textiles/apparel or various services. The study concludes that, for women to take advantage of more capital-intensive industries such as financial or ICT services, more opportunities would need to be provided for them to develop the necessary skills.

The M&E Case Stories point to many projects involving research on trade and women (OECD-WTO 2011, 2017). For example, **USAID** assessed the constraints and opportunities in **cross-border trade** between **Malawi and Botswana**. The study found that women usually lack information on trade border procedures, face higher transaction costs, and have limited access to transportation. The report also illustrates that women are vulnerable to harassment and different forms of gender-based violence at border crossings, including sexual coercion, often by border agents, while staying overnight in transit at borders.

As part of the World Customs Organization's (WCO) project for **customs reform** and modernisation in the East and Southern Africa Region, **Finland** financed workshops for officials on gender mainstreaming in customs with the participation of **Kenya, Eswatini, South Africa, Rwanda, Uganda, Malawi, Zimbabwe and Mauritius and Seychelles**. WCO introduced the Gender Equality Organizational Assessment Tool which helps administrations assess their own policies, procedures and practices in addressing gender equality issues. Additionally, an e-learning module was developed to raise awareness on how to advance gender equality in customs.

Canada and the **Netherlands** financed Trade Mark East Africa (TMEA) to ameliorate the constraints that limit the participation of East African women traders in economic activities and **cross-border trade**, for instance, through gender awareness trainings for custom officials at 12 border posts. Other activities focused on: improving the enabling environment by simplifying, translating and disseminating documentation on trading requirements for small scale traders, most of whom are women; adopting gender-sensitive cross border trade charters; establishing co-operatives and market access platforms for women traders; developing a reporting mechanism on violence against women; collecting sex-disaggregated data; and conducting evidence-based research on issues affecting women traders. One of the activities targets a 30% increase in the use of formal trade channels by the targeted women traders in order to increase their revenue by 10%.

In **trade facilitation**, the **World Bank** assisted the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** to simplify business regulations, facilitate trade, and improve firm-level competitiveness. Specifically, it supported the provision of free advisory services to businesses, including women-led enterprises, and the introduction of computers in provincial offices to allow for easier submission of documentation and enterprise registration. The results are to be measured by the increase in operating licenses in sectors of interest for women[16] and the decrease in the number of procedures for businesses that were started by women. In three and a half years, the project surpassed its target and reached 34% women-owned businesses.

Economic Infrastructure

In the **transport sector**, **IADB** promoted female employment in the operation of heavy machinery for road construction in Latin America. For example, in **Bolivia, Nicaragua and Paraguay**, female personnel of construction and road maintenance companies received support for training and traineeships to develop their technical capacities. The project entailed: gender specific assessment in the market demand for qualified personnel; consideration of specific needs of women's livelihood and skills in order to increase their employability in the sector; and linkage with IADB's transport loan operations to gain support from government counterparts and local communities during implementation. One of the results show that 57% of female trainees in Bolivia scored very high compared to only 5% of male trainees.

In **air transport**, the **AsDB** supported the employment of women in the management and engineering works to upgrade airports and related markets in **Papua New Guinea**. The Bank included a provision for due diligence to identify gender-inclusive actions in order to ensure that women are involved in skills development and in designing airports. The achievement from these actions will be reviewed in progress reports and the project completion report. In **Nicaragua**, **Denmark** supported a **rural road** infrastructure maintenance and construction project to improve connectivity of rural areas. Women were involved as road committee members for the design as well as labours in the project making up 30% of those employed surpassing the 20% target. The evaluation points out that the income generated by the women through the employment allowed them to invest in their home gardens to grow vegetables and produce poultry and pork for sale.

The **United Kingdom** financed a research programme on **Sustainable Energy**, Access and Gender, which consisted of several research projects, including: gender factor in political economy of energy sector dynamics; gender and fossil fuels subsidy reform; and building the evidence base for women's empowerment and entrepreneurship to improve energy interventions' effectiveness. The findings show that energy provision systems are not gender neutral; for instance, men are more likely to capture decision-making over energy resources when provision systems are centralised, such as in the case of central grids. Decentralised energy provision systems like solar energy provide energy at smaller scales which allow for more participation by women in energy management.

In **energy policy**, **Iceland**, along with the UN Environment and other partners, organised a workshop on women entrepreneurs and sustainable energy in **Gabon** in order to promote gender-responsive energy policies across the African continent. It highlighted women's role across the energy value chain to expand economic opportunities and improve access to energy. The outcome included a commitment by African governments to take action on: environmentally sustainable and gender-responsive energy policies; improvement of access to finance and markets by women energy entrepreneurs across the value chain; and capacity building, skills creation and empowerment for women entrepreneurs. Another outcome was the establishment of the African Women Energy Entrepreneurs Framework, which is a platform for exchanging knowledge, accessing finance and accelerating sustainable energy.

Canada is implementing a project in **Burkina Faso** that includes **rural electrification** activities, particularly through the promotion of solar energy, as well as associated business development for women. The installation of solar energy equipment will be used to increase the production, processing and storage of onion, chicken and fish that are important in the region. The project is expected to benefit 40,000 people, especially women through the involvement of women's groups.

The **EU** is implementing a regional program in **Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan** to address **uranium waste** from uranium mining legacy sites, which includes awareness raising on radiation safety, taking into consideration women's time, mobility, and resource constraints. Furthermore, women were encouraged to participate in the training of trainers' workshops. The contents of the training and information materials as well as the public awareness campaign were also designed in a gender-sensitive manner. As a result, 60% of community representatives in campaign events and 85% of workshop participants for teachers and medical personnel were women.

Through the Finnpartnership Programme, **Finland** provided financial support to the Solar Fire Concentration company to invest in small-scale entrepreneurs, especially women, in **Kenya and Tanzania** to reduce energy costs through **solar** technology. In these countries, women collect fuel-wood, which is time-consuming, and use it for cooking, exposing them to hazardous smoke. Therefore, solar thermal is easier, cleaner, and time-saving for women, which also enables them to run small businesses such as bakeries or dehydrating process services for farmers using the energy. Inaddition, ovens utilising solar heat for food processing were installed to allow women to save money that was spent on charcoals. They were used by women's co-operatives to roast peanuts or cashew nuts and dry bananas as well as bakeries run by women. The project also included trainings in installing solar energy electrical devices for the residents, which required the inclusion of women.

In **energy manufacturing**, **Italy** provided trainings for the construction and use of small solar energy systems for women in **Burundi.** Furthermore, through the provision of electricity, the project specifically supported women's embroidery and clothing businesses that used electric sewing machines to produce beddings and clothes, as well as to water pumps for increased agricultural outputs. **UNIDO** also trained women and youth on the productive use of **renewable energy** in the Gambia, which led to the mobilisation of over 1000 women to participate in the programme.

Productive Capacity

The **IADB** supported the Coffee Renewal and Modernisation project in **Colombia** to contribute to the increase of coffee yields and quality of 2,000 small-hold **coffee** growers, of which more than half were women. With the grant, the co-operative will provide loans to coffee growers to purchase small mills, construct drying yards, or repair existing equipment. Technical assistance will help the coffee-growers in complying with certification standards. The expected results of the intervention is an 8% increase in the weight of coffee bean yield and the reduction of damaged beans.

A project by **USAID and Food and Agricultural Organisation** in **Afghanistan** targeted specifically women working in the poultry **value chain** to increase their income through intensive technical training on poultry rearing and vaccinations, sustainable inputs such as feed and drugs, and the establishment of a marketing network of women to link village poultry producers to urban markets. After two years, the project had trained over 21,000 women in poultry management and organised 850 producer groups. According to an evaluation, trainings and organisational development led to an increase in household income for the over 15,000 female producers in egg production.

The **Belgian Investment Company for Developing Countries (BIO)** provided credit to Societe Ivoirienne de Traitement de l'Anacarde (SITA) in **Côte d'Ivoire**. The company, which is led by a woman, employed mostly women in processing cashews. Today, the company is the leader of the cashew industry in the country, which is the second largest exporter of cashew in the world after India. **Spain**, within the framework of a project of the University of Córdoba funded by the **Andalusian Agency for International Development Cooperation**, supported a course at two universities in **Mozambique**, focusing on **natural resources managemen**t with a specific module on incorporating gender perspectives. This project included a publication on forest resources management and household energy production, with special attention to the role of rural women.

The **AsDB** provided a grant to the **Bangladesh** Women Chamber of Commerce and Industry to promote women's **entrepreneurship**. The project enabled 900 women entrepreneurs to receive training for loan applications. As a result, 91 women applicants received loans, with many going on to start a business. In addition, 600 desk officers from financial institutions were trained on pro-women government policies. Building on this project, AsDB is now implementing an SME development project which includes a credit facility with 10% earmarking for SMEs headed by women.

In the **West Bank and Gaza Strip**, the **World Bank** financed the development of the Abraham Path project, a long-distance trekking route where walkers have homestays with local Palestinian families and local guides. Women are usually the main hosts along the Abraham Path, managing and preparing lodging and food. The project also provided opportunities for sale of local women's handicrafts to walkers who pass through or stay in their villages. The World Bank financed the development of the path itself, training of guides and hosts, as well as marketing of the Path through a virtual information hub, location-based mapping, and social media. Women were provided with **tourism** and language training and work-readiness programmes. The latest monitoring report indicated that 196 jobs were created since the start of the initiative in 2014, of which 57% were women.

Case Stories from the Aid for Trade Initiative show many projects incorporating gender perspectives are in agriculture and SMEs, which include trainings, access to microfinance, and quality improvement of products to comply with international standards or certifications (OECD-WTO 2011, 2015, 2017). They also show concrete examples of donor activities in the textile and garment sectors where women are over-represented. The projects focus on ensuring decent working conditions for women by enforcing good labour standards at factories, carrying out spot checks, providing supervisory skills training, and integrating them in labour unions (OECD-WTO 2011).

The **AsDB** supported government reforms in the **Philippines** in **industrial policy** to help boost competitiveness in the country. The project included staff trainings in national agencies focusing on Public Private Partnerships, of which the target of 50% women trainees was established and surpassed. The **United States Inter-American Foundation** supported a project in **mineral exploration** in **Bolivia**, targeting women in mining co-operatives to improve their productivity and income. The project included the provision of machinery, equipment, tools, safety gear and associated training.

Norway supported a project in **Mozambique** in the **oil and gas sector** to enhance technical capabilities of young Mozambicans to benefit from employment opportunities in the sector or related investments. It aimed to train 500 people annually to obtain qualifications as demanded by the oil and gas industry, with a target of 50% women in two years. In the first 18 months, 47% of the 450 trainees completing the course were women. Approximately 25% of the project's facilitators, who were often recruited from the training centre, were also women.

Switzerland provided a grant to the International Finance Corporation (IFC) to develop a programme in **Morocco, Tunisia and Egypt** to improve access to financial and non-financial services for women by providing advisory services to **financial institutions**, such as banks and microfinance institutions. For instance, IFC helps financial institutions to expand their offering, including financial and non-financial services, such as networking opportunities and trainings, to women-led businesses. It also raises awareness and shares knowledge of best practices in women banking among financial institutions. UNIDO also carried out a similar project in the region to increase networking and capacity building of women's associations.

The **Netherlands** supported the development of the Global Banking Alliance (GBA) for Women, an international consortium composed of 46 members – mostly financial institutions – committed to promote women's economic empowerment. Its objective is to increase women's access to capital, markets and trainings. GBA conducts market intelligence research on "women's economy" and also created an online library collecting other related research. Moreover, GBA organises annual summits bringing together women entrepreneurs, academics, bankers and other stakeholders to review best practices, and market innovations for women's economic empowerment. In **Turkey**, **France** provided a loan to the private owned Turkish development and investment bank, TSKB, for a gender-focused line of credit dedicated to companies that proactively employ women or in order to comply with Turkish regulations on **workplace health and safety**. The Bank reported that the credit line contributed to the hiring of about 700 female employees.

The M&E Case Stories also mentions that the **Private Infrastructure Development Group (PIDG)** financed a **multi-sectoral** project that provided ferries, road upgrading and solar powered electricity to serve the Kalangala Island residents in **Uganda**, to increase tourism to the island. The project's training led to the first certified female mariners in Uganda. In the **Philippines**, **Germany** carried out a coastal resource management project where women represented 60% of fish farmers. It aimed at helping women and men avoid overexploitation of **fishing** grounds through training and peer learning activities. With the support of this project, women were appointed to key positions of local groups for sustainable resource management and participated in discussions of the government's regulatory and financial framework, marine protected areas, and capacity development for fishing organisations.

Synthesis and Assessment of Donor Activities

In sum, the above shows that there are several good examples of gender-responsive aid-for-trade activities by donors, including areas such as transport, energy, finance and business, and industry. These projects tend to be smaller in scale than projects in the same sectors that do not incorporate gender dimensions. Many projects entail training of women, either as government officials in policy making or implementation, or as project beneficiaries in enhancing income generating activities. Often there are targets or quotas to ensure that sufficient proportion of the trainees or employment of the local labour force in construction will be women. Other activities involve studies or development of project design that would incorporate gender perspectives in the particular area or activity. While some projects also try to help women connect to the global market, they are frequently limited to the low value added segment in agriculture, handicrafts, and garments.

Table 9.1. Types of activities incorporating gender dimensions in aid for trade

Category	Sector	On women	For women	By women
Trade Policy	Trade policies	■ gender awareness raising tools/trainings/studies ■ application of gender issues in EPAs/policies ■ gender mainstreaming in customs reforms	■ training on, including female government officials ■ simplification of registration including women entrepreneurs ■ free advisory services, including for women entreprises	
Economic Infrastructure	Road		■ employment for female labourers ■ training on road maintenance for women	women as committee members for road design
	Airport		■ employment in upgrading and markets ■ training and provision	women as decision makers in airport planning
	Energy	■ workshop on gender sensitive energy policy ■ studies on gender factor of the energy sector	■ platform for women in energy value chain ■ provision of solar energy for women entrepreneurs ■ training for women on energy use for women's businesses	women trainers
	Industrial policy	■ market research on women's businesses	■ training on PPPs, including female government officials	women facilitators
	Natural resources		■ training and provision of machinery for mineral exploitation, including for women ■ training in oil exploitation, including for women	
	Financial sector	■ establishment of a platform for women's banking ■ training for financial institutions on gender aspects	■ credit for women entrepreneurs ■ training on financial management for entrepreneurs	
	Entrepreneurship		■ training for solar power and income generation for entrepreneurs	
Productive capacity	Tourism		■ training for women in hosting tourists ■ training for women in marine management	
	Textiles	■ enforcement of labour standards where women work ■ training on supervisory skills where women work	■ integration of women in labour unions	
	Agriculture		■ technical co-operation or loans to increase crop yield for female farmers ■ investment in a woman-headed company for cashew processing ■ training on forestry products for women's groups	
	Fisheries		■ training on coastal resource management for fish farmers ■ appointment of women in local groups	women decision-makers in fishery groups

These projects can be categorised as those that involve the upstream policy areas which take account of gender perspectives or those that are downstream which try to help women beneficiaries directly. Another way of looking at it is that some projects are "on women" (training subject), "for women" (trainees or beneficiaries), or "by women" (decision makers or trainers) (see Table 9.1). Aside from traditional bilateral projects, donors also finance specialised international agencies such as ITC, UNIDO, TMEA, as well as help establish global platforms such as the GBA, in order to promote women's economic empowerment regionally or globally. Furthermore, there are efforts to encourage private sector finance to women's economic empowerment, such as by BIO, PIDG, the Finnpartnership Programme, and the G7 DFIs.

In terms of process, most donors are committed to: collect sex-disaggregated data; carry out *ex-ante* gender analysis of the sectoral/institutional context and the project beneficiaries; and conduct monitoring and evaluation of gender dimensions. At the same time, not all donors undertake these activities systematically. For example, the only donors that generally disaggregate the number of people provided with electricity by sex are the EU, the Netherlands, New Zealand, AfDB, and the World Bank (OECD 2019b). As data collection on, *inter alia*, access to energy by its citizens and consumers is the responsibility of the national government, in many cases, donors need to encourage partner countries to disaggregate data by sex. Furthermore, some donors emphasise process indicators for their internal institutional gender mainstreaming – unrelated to partner country impact – such as increasing training for development co-operation staff on gender sensitisation, proportion of female managers in aid agencies, and organising meetings on gender mainstreaming in administrations.

Others have output indicators such as the number of women trained, accessing energy or receiving financial advisory services. However, there are only few donors that use indicators that are more outcome oriented, This is reflected in the M&E 2019 exercise which showed that only half the donors stated that they have any indicator to track women's economic empowerment in aid for trade. The few donors mentioning that they have indicators pertain predominantly to sex-disaggregated data, such as the number or proportion of women who were able to be employed in unskilled, technical, management, or supervisory roles, secured land titles, or obtained financing. Other output indicators involved the number of households adopting workload saving energy technologies or registered businesses owned solely or jointly by women.

The activities to promote women's economic empowerment in some aid-for-trade sectors are particularly important in contexts where social norms could constrain women's access to the market or finance, including for the poorest and marginalised. Therefore, some donors consider that, to have the greatest positive impact, gender-responsive aid for trade should be combined with other efforts to address poverty and inequalities. Others highlight the relevance of promoting women's employment in male-dominated jobs, notably in the transport sector where few women are employed, generally in low paid positions, such as cleaning or traffic signalling. Women's professional development and economic opportunities in certain sectors are constrained by discriminatory stereotypes and restrictive gender roles dictating which jobs are appropriate for women.

At the same time short-term trainings and employment in projects may not be enough for policy changes or to sustain women's economic activities, thereby limiting the effectiveness of interventions carried out by the donors (Buvinic, Furst-Nichols 2014). Aside from filling targets of involving women in training or consultations, these activities could report *ex-post* how policies or project designs were adjusted due to the enhanced women's involvement. Furthermore, projects that target women as recipients of loans, producers of tradable goods, or employees of male-dominated jobs that could lead to income generation and entrepreneurship would also need to be scaled up to have wider impact. This will also require co-operation to help partner government improve the enabling policy and legal environment.

Moreover, it would be necessary for donors to ensure that, systematically, sex-disaggregated data are collected, *ex-ante* analyses are carried out, and indicators related to gender are included in their results frameworks, to the extent possible aligning to the SDG indicators and to partner country results frameworks. In this respect, donors could also help strengthen partner countries' statistical and results based management systems, particularly in capturing gender dimensions. Beyond establishing an adequate monitoring and evaluation system, donors also need to use the results information generated through these systems to learn what works and what does not. Specifically, it is important to better understand how the incorporation of gender perspectives in key aid-for-trade sectors can lead to long-term and sustainable outcomes for women's economic empowerment. Finally, it is also essential to replicate good practices and improve programming – alongside communicating on the results achieved.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Women's economic empowerment has been recognised as one of the key drivers of sustainable development and gender equality. In this context, trade can advance women's position as economic actors with positive benefits for them and their families. On the other hand, special attention needs to be paid to negative impacts of trade liberalisation on women. Aid for trade should therefore enable women to gain from trade, particularly through active and meaningful participation in the relevant sectors, and minimise adverse impacts in pursuing economic opportunities. In this context, the WTO Task Force on Aid for Trade established a guiding principle to take account of the gender perspective in aid for trade in order to catalyse women's role in sustainable and inclusive development.

In recent years, donors have increased gender-responsive aid for trade overall. In particular, donors are addressing this relatively well in agriculture, cottage industries, SMEs, and microfinance. Some donors have explicit strategies and guidelines to support economic empowerment of women in these areas. On the other hand, gender perspectives are not taken into account very well in sectors such as transport, energy, communications, industry, finance and business. In particular, many bilateral donors generally do not have strategies or guidelines on how to promote women's economic empowerment in these areas.

Nevertheless, there are some good examples of gender-responsive aid for trade in the difficult areas that could be shared with other donors whose approaches are not as well developed. These activities consist of: ensuring that women are part of training programmes; income generating projects for women; increased financial access and employment for women and studies on strengthening gender dimensions for the particular sector policy. At the same time, many donors still lack adequate indicators or monitoring and evaluation systems to assess impact on women's economic empowerment in these areas. These mechanisms will help to obtain insights about how activities that take account of gender perspectives can better contribute to women's economic empowerment.

The 2004 GENDERNET's guide on Why Gender Matters in Infrastructure mentions:

> *Although the policies of many aid agencies state that gender equality is critical to project sustainability and to the achievement to the MDGs, agencies often experience very real difficulties translating their political and policy commitments into practice on the ground. This is particularly true of large-scale infrastructure projects...*

Box 9.7. In my view – Ann Linde, *Minister for Foreign Trade,* Sweden

The 2030 Agenda strengthens the prominence of international trade as an aim as well as a means of sustainable development, and recognises the importance of aid for trade. My Government is highly dedicated to these commitments. One sign of this is our strong support for the Aid for Trade initiative. In addition, as trade minister of the world's first officially feminist government I use available platforms for pushing the gender equality agenda forward, mainly the WTO and EU's free trade agreements but also through aid for trade. Sweden mobilises efforts around comprehensive gender integration across all development co-operation. This is notable for example in the Government's Policy Framework for Development Cooperation. In addition, since 2018 Sweden has a global strategy for development cooperation for gender equality and women's and girls' rights.

Historically, trade has proven to be an engine for development and poverty reduction by boosting growth, particularly in developing countries. The world has witnessed an enormous economic transformation over the past three decades. As goods, services, capital, and people flow across countries faster than ever before, information and knowledge have become global commodities. In addition, the digital revolution has opened great opportunities for growth, jobs and sustainable development around the world. At the same time, the OECD has found that around the world, some 250 million fewer women than men are online – many of them in developing countries. This at a time when there is plenty of evidence to suggest that digital access can help boost women's personal development and wider prosperity. The Women and the Web report by Intel found that enabling greater internet access in the developing world would contribute an estimated 13 to 18 billion dollars to annual GDP across 144 countries.

Given that the SDG's put significant emphasis on the role that trade plays in achieving the global goals and the 2030 Agenda, it was an eye-opener to read that only a small part of gender marked aid for trade is going to the category "Trade policy". I was also surprised to read that few donors integrate gender perspectives in key aid-for-trade sectors, one of them the ICT sector. If this is due to lack of guidelines, then we must start work on setting up guidelines in areas that are essential for contributing to women's economic empowerment and achieving global goals and the 2030 Agenda.

Analyses like this are extremely relevant and useful and it is precisely this type of effort that is needed to move from talk to action. Indeed, this is very much a wakeup call for both donors and partner countries to take gender issues in trade seriously. The gender policy marker is a useful tool in this regard and we are aware of the continuous quality assurance that OECD-DAC is carrying out, to ensure harmonized application of this marker among donors.

Fifteen years later, this quote still applies, not only for infrastructure, but many other aid-for-trade areas, although less for agriculture, SMEs, handicrafts, and microfinance. This calls for further research and analysis to build the evidence base on how donors can contribute to women's economic empowerment – going beyond short-term trainings for women and employment in project – and looking at how income-generating projects can be scaled up for wider impact and sustainability. In this context, sharing or better implementation of the guidance on how to plan, monitor and evaluate donor activities in contributing to women's economic empowerment through aid for trade, particularly in areas such as transport, energy, communication, finance and business, mining and industry, might be useful (see Box 9.7), building on work by the DAC GENDERNET.

One element could include exploring how to carry out gender assessments or diagnostics that would consider the impact of infrastructure on women's unpaid care work by examining patterns of mobility or energy use, particularly among the poor in rural areas. Furthermore, it could also encourage more awareness raising and training for men and women to design gender sensitive infrastructure investments (OECD 2019a). Moreover, some donors point to the need for: strong senior leadership and political will to ensure implementation of this agenda; adequate resources, sufficient number of experts with requisite skills and experience, and capacity building for mainstreaming; careful selection of implementing partners with aligned goals; and ensuring accountability. All of these efforts could particularly contribute to two SDGs – Goal 5, which addresses women's empowerment, including access to land ownership and financial services as well as unpaid care through the provision of infrastructure, and Goal 8, which promotes women to be engaged in productive employment.

NOTES

1. Para 157 "Although some new employment opportunities have been created for women as a result of the globalization of the economy, there are also trends that have exacerbated inequalities between women and men. At the same time, globalization, including economic integration, can create pressures on the employment situation of women to adjust to new circumstances and to find new sources of employment as patterns of trade change. More analysis needs to be done of the impact of globalization on women's economic status."
2. In the M&E 2013, Canada, the Netherlands, and the UK, stated that evaluations on the impacts of their value chain projects on women's economic empowerment, generally concluded that there were positive changes.
3. Other recommendations are: 1) sharing our respective experiences relating to policies and programs to encourage women's participation in national and international economies through WTO information exchanges, as appropriate, and voluntary reporting during the WTO trade policy review process; 2) Sharing best practices for conducting gender-based analysis of trade policies and for the monitoring of their effects; 3) Sharing methods and procedures for the collection of gender-disaggregated data, the use of indicators, monitoring and evaluation methodologies, and the analysis of gender-focused statistics related to trade; and 4) Working together in the WTO to remove barriers for women's economic empowerment and increase their participation in trade.
4. This question was not asked in the M&E for the later years.
5. See https://www.empowerwomen.org/en/who-we-are/initiatives/sg-high-level-panel-on-womens-economic-empowerment
6. This includes the concessional Official Development Assistance and non-concessional developmental Other Official Flows.
7. Between 1998 to 2017, Official Development Finance to health, education, government and civil society and water accounted between 42% to 61% of bilateral allocable gender marked commitments.
8. The goal of GENDERNET is to improve policies and practices to strengthen gender equality in development programmes and to secure girls' and women's rights, contributing to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. http://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/about-gendernet.htm
9. The data used for How Does Aid Support Women's Economic Empowerment? consist of only ODA and of DAC Members, whereas data for this Chapter include both ODA and Other Official Flows of DAC members and multilateral development banks. On the other hand, the former includes a wider range of sectors such as Urban Development, Public Finance Management, and Employment Policies which are not included in this Chapter as they are not part of the aid-for-trade sectors.
10. According to the World Trade Organization (WTO) Task Force on Aid for Trade, projects and programmes are part of aid for trade if these activities have been identified as trade-related development priorities in the partner country's national development strategies. Furthermore, the WTO Task Force concluded that to measure aid-for-trade flows, the following categories should be included: technical assistance for trade policy and regulations, trade-related infrastructure, productive capacity building (including trade development), trade-related adjustment, other trade-related needs. The DAC's CRS database was recognised as the best available data source for tracking global aid-for-trade flows. It should be kept in mind that the CRS does not provide data that match exactly all of the above aid-for-trade categories. In fact, the CRS provides proxies under four headings: trade policy and regulations, economic infrastructure, building productive capacity, and trade-related adjustment.

The CRS covers all ODA, but only those activities reported under the above four categories can be identified as aid for trade. It is not possible to distinguish activities in the context of "other trade-related needs". To estimate the volume of such "other" activities, 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 has 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. Consequently, accurately monitoring aid for trade would require comparison of the CRS data with donor and partner countries' self-assessments of their aid for trade. The list of sectors included in aid for trade can be found in: http://www.oecd.org/dac/aft/Aid-for-trade-sector-codes.pdf.

11. Communications does not include ICT related assistance in other sectors such as health, education, business, public financial management, and so on.
12. The annual average amount of gender marked projects versus non-gender marked projects in 2014-17 were, respectively: USD 2million versus USD 4 million in energy; USD 0.9 million versus USD 3 million in industry and mining; and USD 3 million and USD 4 million in finance and business.
13. Africa includes data for Africa, Middle East, North of Sahara and South of Sahara. Latin America and Caribbean includes data for America, North & Central America, and South America. Asia includes data for Asia, Far East Asia, Oceania and South & Central Asia.
14. This work was led by the OECD Development Centre which has many developing countries as its members and not all DAC members are its members.
15. The projects were mostly identified from the DAC's credit reporting system. Supplementary information was obtained through on-line sources or contacts with the respective donors.
16. Sectors are unspecified in the World Bank document.

REFERENCES

Abukumail, A.H. (2017) West Bank and Gaza - Abraham Path: Economic Development across Fragile Communities : P147235 - Implementation Status Results Report : Sequence 06, World Bank Group. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/761131496943874637/West-Bank-and-Gaza-Abraham-Path-Economic-Development-across-Fragile-Communities-P147235-Implementation-Status-Results-Report-Sequence-06, Washington, D.C.

African Development Bank (2009), Checklist for Gender Mainstreaming in the Infrastructure Sector, African Development Bank Group. https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Policy-Documents/Checklist%20for%20Gender%20Maintstreaming%20in%20the%20Infrastructure%20Sector.pdf

Asian Development Bank, "Papua New Guinea: Civil Aviation Development Investment Program", Project information, https://www.adb.org/projects/43141-013/main

Asian Development Bank, "Philippines: Increasing Competitiveness for Inclusive Growth Program", Project information, https://www.adb.org/projects/43396-014/main#project-pds

Buvinic, M., R. Furst-Nichols, (2014) Promoting Women's Economic Empowerment : What Works?. Policy Research Working Paper; No. 7087, World Bank Group, Washington, DC.

Çagatay, N. (2001), Trade, Gender and Poverty, United Nations Development Programme Background paper, Social Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy

Cuberes, D. and M. Teignier (2016), "Aggregate Effects of Gender Gaps in the Labor Market: A Quantitative Estimate", Journal of Human Capital 10 (1): 1–32

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia (2015), Strategy for Australia's Aid for Trade Investments, https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/strategy-for-australias-aid-for-trade-investments.pdf

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia (2016), Gender equality and women's empowerment strategy, https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment-strategy.pdf

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia (2017), Australia advancing women's economic empowerment through aid, trade and economic diplomacy, http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=2ahUKEwjUv8aTtdnhAhWK3OAKHfYTDqAQFjABegQIAxAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fdfat.gov.au%2Fabout-us%2Fpublications%2FDocuments%2Faustralia-advancing-womens-economic-empowerment-aid-trade-economic-diplomacy.pdf&usg=AOvVaw3gMYsSsP5u1PO3MxBITxwm

Elson et al (2007), Feminist Economics of Trade, Routledge IAFFE Advances in Feminist Economics (Book 5), Routledge; 1 edition (August 16, 2007), 352p.

European Union (2007), Joint EU Strategy on Aid for Trade, Council of the European Union, General Secretariat, Note 14470/07, https://register.consilium.europa.eu/doc/srv?l=EN&f=ST%2014470%202007%20INIT , Brussels

European Union (2015), "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: Transforming the Lives of Girls and Women through EU External Relations 2016-2020", Joint Staff Working Document SWD(2015) 182 final, European Commission, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/150921_final_swd_gap.pdf

European Union (2017), Achieving Prosperity through Trade and Investment. Updating the 2007 Joint EU Strategy on Aid for Trade, Commission Communication COM (2017) 667 of 13 November 2017 and Council Conclusions 15573/17 of 11 December 2017, https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/com_2017_667_f1_communication_from_commission_to_inst_en_v3_p1_954389.pdf

European Union (2018), EU Aid for Trade Progress Report 2018, European Commission, Directorate–General for International Cooperation and Development, https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/eu-aid-trade-progress-report-2018_en

Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland (2018), Report on Effectiveness Swiss international cooperation in the field of gender equality 2007–2016, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC, https://www.eda.admin.ch/dam/deza/en/documents/publikationen/Wirkungsberichte/Wirkungsbericht-Geschlechtergleichstellung-2007-2016_EN.pdf, Bern

Ferrant, G. (2011), "How Gender Inequalities Hinder Development: Cross-Country Evidence", CES Working Papers, Centre d'Économie de la Sorbonne, (ISSN: 1955-611X. 2011)

Food and Agriculture Organisation, International Fund for Agricultural Development, International Labour Office (2010) Agricultural value chain development: Threat or opportunity for women's employment?, Gender and Rural Employment Policy Brief, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/documents/publication/wcms_150833.pdf

Foundation, The Asia (2018) Emerging Lessons on Women's Entrepreneurship in Asia and the Pacific: Case Studies from the Asian Development Bank and The Asia Foundation, Asian Development Bank, http://hdl.handle.net/11540/8796

Gonzales, C., S. Jain-Chandra, K. Kochhar, M. Newiak, and T. Zeinullayev (2015) "Women and Tackling Income Inequality", International Monetary Fund, Staff Discussion Notes No. 15/20

Heath, R. and M. Mobarak (2015) Manufacturing, Manufacturing growth and the lives of Bangladeshi women, Journal of Development Economics 115, 1–15

IFC (2016) Investing in Women along Agribusiness Value Chains, International Finance Corporation, https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/d19235d7-2ba7-4f7b-b0c6-5198fe9e4d30/Women+in+Agri+VC_Report_FINAL.pdf?MOD=AJPERES, Washington

ILO (2016) Closing the gender pay gap: a review of the issues, policy mechanisms and international evidence, International Labour Office, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---gender/documents/publication/wcms_540889.pdf, Geneva

ILO (2017), World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2017, International Labour Office, https://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/weso/2017/WCMS_541211/lang--en/index.htm, Geneva

ILO (2018), World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends for Women 2018, Global snapshot

International Labour Office, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_619577.pdf , Geneva

Iqbal, S. (2018) Women, Business, and the Law 2018, World Bank Group, http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/926401524803880673/Women-Business-and-the-Law-2018, Washington, D.C.

Kasseeah H. and V. Tandrayen-Ragoobur (2015) "Selfemployed women and their access to finance: perspectives from the informal sector", African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development, 7:4, 247-254

Kimm Gnangnon, S. (2018) "Aid for Trade and Employment in Developing Countries: An empirical evidence", Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations, 33 (1):77-100

Knowles, S., P. Lorgelly, D. Owen (2002), "Are educational gender gaps a brake on economic development? Some cross-country empirical evidence", Oxford University Press, Oxford Economic Papers 54 (1): 118-149

Korinek, J. (2005), "Trade and Gender: Issues and Interactions", OECD Trade Policy Working Paper No. 24

Mason, A.D., E.M. King, (2001) Engendering development through gender equality in rights, resources, and voice, World Bank, Policy research report, http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/512911468327401785/Engendering-development-through-gender-equality-in-rights-resources-and-voice, Washington DC

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand, (2012), Tourism and Gender Equality Knowledge Note, Aid & Development, https://www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/Aid-Prog-docs/Tools-and-guides/Gender-Knowledge-Note-Tourism.pdf

Morrison, A., R. Dhushyanth and S. Nistha (2007) Gender equality, poverty and economic growth, World Bank, Policy Research working paper no. WPS 4349, http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/758041468340239015/Gender-equality-poverty-and-economic-growth, Washington, DC

Nilufer, C. (2001) "Trade, Gender and Poverty", background paper to the UNDP project on Trade and Sustainable Human Development, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

OECD (2019a), Breaking down Barriers to Women's Economics Empowerment: Policy Approaches to Unpaid Care Work, OECD Development, Policy Papers No. 18, OECD Publishing, https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/breaking-down-barriers-to-women-s-economic-empowerment_c4ff3ddb-en, Paris

OECD (2019), "OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System: aid activity", OECD International Development Statistics (database)., DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/data-00061-en, (accessed on 25 January 2019)

OECD (2019, b), Using the SDGs as a shared framework for results, SDG indicator 7.1.1: Electricity Access, Draft Technical report, OECD-DAC Results Community Workshop 4-5 April 2019, https://www.oecd.org/dac/results-development/docs/Results_SDG_Case_studies_technical_report_7.1.1_draft_web.pdf

OECD DAC (2004), "Why Gender Matters in Infrastructure", OECD DAC's Network on Gender Equality, https://www.ssatp.org/sites/ssatp/files/publications/HTML/Gender-RG/Source%20%20documents/Issue%20and%20Strategy%20Papers/G&T%20Rationale/ISGT10%20Why%20Gender%20matters%20in%20infrastructure%20OECD%20DAC%202004.pdf

OECD DAC (1999), DAC Guidelines for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in Development Co-operation, Development Co-operation Guidelines Series, OECD Publications, https://www.empowerwomen.org/en/who-we-are/initiatives/sg-high-level-panel-on-womens-economic-empowerment, Paris

OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality (2016), Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker, https://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/Handbook-OECD-DAC-Gender-Equality-Policy-Marker.pdf

OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality (2018), How Does Aid Support Women's Economic Empowerment?, http://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/How-Does-Aid-Support-Womens-Economic-Empowerment.pdf

OECD-WTO (2011), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2011 (questionnaires) www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/countryprofiles/

OECD-WTO (2011), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2011 (case stories) http://www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/casestories/

OECD-WTO (2015), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2015 (questionnaires) www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/countryprofiles/

OECD-WTO (2015), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2015 (case stories) http://www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/casestories/

OECD-WTO (2017), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2017 (questionnaires) www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/countryprofiles/

OECD-WTO (2017), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2017 (case stories) http://www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/casestories/

OECD-WTO (2019), aid-for-trade monitoring exercise 2019 (questionnaires) www.oecd.org/aidfortrade/countryprofiles/

Omi, M. (2013), Trade Liberalization and Women : A Feminist Analysis of the WTO System (in Japanese), Shogakusha; First edition (June 28, 2013), Tokyo, 262p.

OPIC (2019), Factsheet 2X Women's Initiative, http://opic-2x.sage-dev.net/

Ostry, J.D., A. Berg, and C.G. Tsangarides (2014), "Redistribution, Inequality, and Growth", International Monetary Fund, Staff Discussion Notes No. 14/02

Osundu, C.K., S. I. Ogbonna and C. O. Emerole (2015), "Level and Determinants of Women Farmers Access to Informal Credit in Abia State, Nigeria", Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology 7(1): 1-10

Palacios-López, A. and R. López (2015), "The Gender Gap in Agricultural Productivity: The Role of Market Imperfections", The Journal of Development Studies, 51(9), 1175-1192, DOI: 10.1080/00220388.2015.1028539

Sahay, R., M. Čihák, and other IMF Staff (2018), "Women in Finance: A Case for Closing Gaps", International Monetary Fund, Staff Discussion Note SDN/18/05

Terada-Hagiwara, A., Shiela, F. Camingue-Romance, and J.E. Zveglich, Jr. (2018), "Gender Pay Gap: A Macro Perspective", Asian Development Bank, Economics working paper series No. 538

UN (1995), Declaration of the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women Beijing, Beijing, China https://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/platform/economy.htm

UN (2015), Sustainable Development Goals website, The Sustainable Development Agenda, https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/development-agenda/

UN (2017) "Leave no one behind: Taking Action for Transformational Change on Women's Economic Empowerment", Second report Report of the UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Women's Economic Empowerment, United Nations, https://www.unscn.org/uploads/web/news/UNSG-HLP-WEE-2nd-Report-.pdf, New York

UN Women (2015), Progress of the World's Women 2015-2016: Transforming Economies, Realizing Rights, United Nations, http://progress.unwomen.org/en/2015/pdf/UNW_progressreport.pdf, New York

UN Women (2018), Empower Women website, https://www.empowerwomen.org/en/who-we-are/initiatives/sg-high-level-panel-on-womens-economic-empowerment

UNIDO (2015), Guide on Gender Mainstreaming Trade Capacity-Building Projects, UNIDO Gender, https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2015-02/Gender_TCB_Guide_0.pdf, United Nations Office at Vienna

WEF (2015), The Global Gender Gap Report 2015, World Economic Forum, Geneva http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2015/

World Bank (2009), Mainstreaming Gender into Extractive Industries Projects Guidance, Note for Task Team Leaders, Extractive Industries and Development Series #9, http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTOGMC/Resources/eifd9_gender_guidance.pdf, Washington DC

World Bank (2012), "World Development Report 2012: Gender Equality and Development", https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/4391, Washington DC

World Bank (2015a). The cost of the gender gap in agricultural productivity in Malawi, Tanzania, and Uganda, World Bank Group, http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/847131467987832287/The-cost-of-the-gender-gap-in-agricultural-productivity-in-Malawi-Tanzania-and-Uganda, Washington, D.C.

World Bank, (2015b) World Bank Group gender strategy (FY16-23) : gender equality, poverty reduction and inclusive growth, World Bank Group, http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/820851467992505410/World-Bank-Group-gender-strategy-FY16-23-gender-equality-poverty-reduction-and-inclusive-growth, Washington, D.C.

World Bank, Government of Liberia (2010) Gender aware Programs and Women's Roles in Agricultural Value Chains in Liberia, https://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTGENDER/Resources/LibSum-fin-rev1.pdf

WTO Aid for Trade Task Force (2006), Recommendations of the Task Force on Aid for Trade, WT/AFT/1, 27 July 2006 http://docsonline.wto.org/imrd/directdoc.asp?DDFDocuments/t/WT/AFT/1.doc

WTO, (2017) Joint Declaration on Trade and Women's Economic Empowerment on the Occasion of the WTO Ministerial Conference in Buenos Aires in December 2017 https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/minist_e/mc11_e/genderdeclarationmc11_e.pdf

2X Challenge website, https://www.2xchallenge.org/

2X Challenge (2018), 2X Criteria, https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5b180402c3c16a6fe0001e45/t/5bdc3ef321c67c31502108f4/1541160694250/2X+Challenge+Criteria+%2818+October+2018%29.pdf

AID-FOR-TRADE COUNTRY PROFILES

EXPLANATORY NOTES ON AID-FOR-TRADE COUNTRY PROFILES

The aid-for-trade country profiles provide factual information to stimulate a debate on trends of aid for trade, trade costs, trade performance and development at the country level. The aim is to compare a country's performance in four categories of indicators from 2006 to 2017 and, for selected indicators, against country group benchmarks.

The country profiles are structured according to the results chain framework normally used in project-based development interventions. The results chain framework describes the causal sequence of development interventions based on four main elements: i) inputs and activities produce ii) direct outputs, which in turn lead to iii) intermediate outcomes that contribute to iv) long-term impacts.

The country profiles transpose the idea behind this project-based analytical tool to the macro level and trace a possible causal sequence of aid-for-trade interventions to achieve trade and development objectives. The country profiles therefore present indicators in four sections: A. Development Finance; B. Trade Costs; C. Trade Performance; and D. Development Indicators. Much of aid for trade is aimed at reducing trade costs; lower trade costs increase connectivity and lead to better trade performance in terms of growth and diversification; better trade performance can help improve long-term development indicators, notably through employment creation and poverty alleviation.

The country profiles do not posit a causal link; they do not attempt to test or estimate the causal impact of aid for trade at the macro level. Instead, they give a dynamic perspective on a country's development. In this sense, the sequence traced is one of contribution, not attribution. Where such contribution can be discerned, the country profiles provide ground for further in-depth, country-based research. In this sense, the country profiles contribute to a greater understanding of the important role that aid-for-trade flows play in a country's achievement of the trade and development objectives targeted by these flows.

Most indicators in the country profiles provide a comparison between 2006 and 2017. However, the year coverage is adapted to data availability at the level of both indicators and countries. For a selected number of indicators, comparisons against benchmark groups are shown. The country groups used as benchmarks are least developed countries (LDCs), lower middle income countries (LMICs), upper middle income countries (UMICs) and high income countries (HICs) based on the current United Nation's list of LDCs and the World Bank's income group classification for 2017. The country groups are non-overlapping, which means that LDCs are not included in income groups. Tajikistan and Zimbabwe, which are low income countries but not LDCs, are benchmarked against LMICs. The country composition of the four country groups differs among indicators according to data availability. The number of countries included in the four groups for a given indicator is provided in the indicator descriptions below.

The country profiles are divided into the following four sections:

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

Development finance constitutes a vital source of external financing for many developing countries as it comprises inflows of foreign direct investment (FDI), remittances, official development assistance (ODA), and other official flows (OOF). Development finance is used to finance capital investment as well as private and public consumption, which thereby forms the basis for economic growth and development.

This section illustrates how aid-for-trade flows have developed over time, how important they are compared to other flows of development finance and the importance of aid-for-trade for a country compared to other countries. Furthermore, the section shows trends in aid-for-trade disbursements over time at the aggregate level and at the level of sectors and donors. Development finance flows are presented for the periods 2006/08 and 2014/16 (three year averages) and for the year 2017.

Indicators and sources

FDI is defined as an investment involving a long-term relationship and reflecting a lasting interest in and control by a resident entity in one economy (foreign direct investor or parent enterprise) of an enterprise resident in a different economy (foreign affiliate). FDI inflows measure the net capital (equity capital, reinvested earnings and intra-company loans) provided by a foreign direct investor to a foreign affiliate. Source: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat.

Remittances comprise personal transfers and compensation of employees. Personal transfers consist of transfers in cash or in kind received by resident households from non-resident households. Compensation of employees refers to the income of border, seasonal, and other short-term workers who are employed in an economy where they are not resident and of residents employed by non-resident entities. Compensation of employees tends to account for a high share of remittances in the case of developing countries which are close to a bigger economy such as Lesotho, which borders South Africa, or which are characterised by the presence of non-resident institutions such as Afghanistan. Source: World Bank (WB), World Development Indicators.

Official development assistance (ODA) are grants and loans provided by the official sector with the main objective to promote economic development and welfare of developing countries. ODA is concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 percent (calculated at a discount rate of 10 percent). **Aid-for-trade** flows are a subset of ODA that fall under the four categories trade policy and regulations, economic infrastructure, building productive capacity and trade-related adjustment. ODA and aid-for-trade flows are reported as gross disbursements. Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database.

Other official flows (OOF) are transactions by the official sector which do not meet the conditions for eligibility as ODA, either because they are not primarily aimed at development, or because they have a grant element of less than 25 percent. **Trade-related OOF** are a subset of OOF that fall under the four categories trade policy and regulations, economic infrastructure, building productive capacity and trade-related adjustment. OOF and trade-related OOF flows are reported as gross disbursements. Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database.

The top **three aid-for-trade priorities** are based on a ranking of aid-for-trade categories given by countries in self-assessment questionnaires. Source: OECD/WTO Partner Country Questionnaire.

Share of aid for trade in development finance indicates a country's dependence on aid for trade in comparison to other development finance flows. Development finance corresponds to the sum of FDI inflows, remittances, OOF and ODA. For the periods 2006-08 and 2014-16, development finance is calculated as the sum of the three year averages of these four flows. Number of countries included in benchmark groups: LDCs (36), LMICs (25), UMICs (42). Sources: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators.

Share of aid for trade in gross fixed capital formation indicates the importance of aid for trade for the financing of gross fixed capital formation. Gross fixed capital formation includes land improvements; plant, machinery, and equipment purchases; and the construction of roads, railways, and the like, including schools, offices, hospitals, private residential dwellings, and commercial and industrial buildings. Number of countries included in benchmark groups: LDCs (29), LMICs (26), UMICs (35). Sources: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators.

B. TRADE COSTS

In the results chain, inputs and accompanying activities result in outputs. One of the main objectives of aid-for-trade projects is to reduce trade costs. The trade costs section covers indicators that allow assessing how a country's infrastructure and policy-related trade costs have evolved over time and how high trade costs are in comparison to a benchmark country group.

Indicators and sources

Tariffs: Simple and weighted averages of applied import tariffs measure most-favoured-nation (MFN) applied duties calculated either as simple average or as weighted average using import flows at the Harmonized System (HS) six-digit level as weights. The weighted average export tariff faced takes into account preferences and measures the weighted average tariff faced by the country in its top five export markets for agricultural and non-agricultural products, respectively. The share of duty-free exports measures the share of exports reaching these top export markets for agricultural and non-agricultural products duty-free. Source: WTO, World Tariff Profiles.

Information and Communication Technology (ICT) connectivity (% of population): Mobile (fixed) broadband subscriptions refer to the percentage of inhabitants with an active mobile (fixed) broadband subscription. Internet users refer to the percentage of the population using the internet. Source: ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators.

Cost and time to trade measure the cost in USD and the time in hours required for documentary and border compliance when an economy imports a standardized shipment of auto parts from its natural import partner or when the economy exports its most important product in value terms (except oil and mining products) to its natural export partner. Documentary compliance captures the cost and time associated with compliance with the documentary requirements of all government agencies of the origin economy, the destination economy and any transit economies. Documentary compliance includes the cost and time for obtaining, preparing, processing, presenting and submitting documents. Border compliance captures the cost and time associated with compliance with the economy's customs regulations and with regulations relating to other mandatory border inspections, for instance regarding sanitary and phytosanitary standards, as well as the cost and time for handling that takes place at its port or border. Number of countries included in benchmark groups: LDCs (44), LMICs (31), UMICs (51), HICs (58). Source: WB, Doing Business.

Logistics performance index (LPI) (1-5): The "Overall LPI" is a perception-based composite indicator of a country's logistics based on six components. These components are efficiency and border clearance ("Customs"), quality of trade and transport infrastructure ("Infrastructure"), ease of arranging competitively priced shipments ("International shipments"), competence and quality of logistics services ("Logistics competence"), ability to track and trace consignments ("Tracking and tracing") and frequency with which shipments reach consignees within scheduled or expected delivery times ("Timeliness"). The index and its components range from 1 to 5, with a higher score representing better performance. Number of countries included in benchmark groups: LDCs (39), LMICs (25), UMICs (41), HICs (51). Source: WB, Logistics Performance Index.

Competitiveness indicators (1-7): The competitiveness indicators measure the perceptions of business executives regarding the access to finance of SMEs, the efficiency of train services, the quality of roads, the efficiency of seaport services, the efficiency of air transport services and the competition in network services. The ratings range from 1 (low) to 7 (best). Number of countries included in benchmark groups: LDCs (27), LMICs (25), UMICs (34), HICs (52). Source: WEF, Global Competitiveness Report 2018.

Trade costs (ad valorem, %): These indicators capture a country's total, intra-regional and extra-regional ad-valorem trade costs in percent. The trade costs measures are calculated as simple averages of bilateral ad valorem trade costs. Given the limited data availability, the number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs differs across countries. Therefore, the measure is informative regarding a country's evolution of trade costs over time but comparisons between countries should be undertaken with much caution. The bilateral trade costs are derived from observable trade flows representing the geometric mean of international trade costs between two countries relative to domestic trade costs within each country. The intuition of the measure is that if bilateral trade increases relative to domestic trade flows, bilateral trade costs have declined. The database and the bilateral trade cost measure are described in Arvis et al. (2013). To calculate intra- and extra-regional trade costs, trading partners are grouped according to the WTO classification into the following regions: Africa, Asia, Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Europe, Middle East, North America, South and Central America (including the Caribbean). Source: Author's calculations based on the ESCAP/World Bank Trade Cost Database.

Trade facilitation indicators (0-2): The trade facilitation indicators are composite indicators that measure various dimensions of trade facilitation, most of them closely related to the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement, on a range from 0 (low) to 2 (best). The country profiles show the following six indicators (out of a total of eleven) for which data coverage is best: Information availability (publication of trade information, including on internet; enquiry points), Advance rulings (prior statements by the administration to requesting traders concerning the classification, origin, valuation method, etc., applied to specific goods at the time of importation; the rules and process applied to such statements), Appeal procedures (the possibility and modalities to appeal administrative decisions by border agencies), Automation (electronic exchange of data; automated border procedures; use of risk management), Procedures (streamlining of border controls; single windows; post-clearance audits; authorised economic operators), Governance and impartiality (customs structures and functions; accountability; ethics policy). Number of countries included in benchmark groups: LDCs (36), LMICs (28), UMICs (43), HICs (54). Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators.

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

Aid for trade interventions aim at improving the trade performance of firms and countries by addressing national supply side constraints to either lower trade costs or improve the productive capacity of firms. This section covers indicators that allow assessing the trade performance of countries in terms of value, growth, structure and diversification.

Indicators and sources

Trade to GDP ratio is estimated as an economy's total trade of goods and commercial services (exports + imports, balance of payments basis) divided by its GDP. Source: WTO Secretariat.

Commercial services as % of total exports (imports) refers to the share of commercial services in world exports (imports) of commercial services and goods. Trade flows are measured by balance of payments statistics according to the principles of the sixth edition of the Balance of Payments Manual (BPM6). Source: WTO Secretariat.

Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports [imports]) refers to the share of non-fuel intermediate goods in merchandise exports (imports) as measured by customs statistics. Intermediates are classified according to the UN Broad Economic Categories (BEC) classification. Fuel products are not classified as intermediates but are included in total merchandise exports. Source: UN Comtrade.

Trade flows (billion current US$) provide exports and imports of goods and commercial services as measured by balance of payment statistics according to the principles of BPM6. Balance of payment statistics cover transactions between residents of a country and non-residents involving a change of ownership. Source: WTO Secretariat.

Number of products and markets: The numbers of exported and imported products and the numbers of export and import markets provide simple measures of product and market diversification, respectively. The maximum number of markets is 237 while the maximum number of products, defined at the Harmonized System (HS) 2002 4-digit level, is 1,245. Source: Author's calculations based on UN Comtrade data.

Hirschman-Herfindahl (HH) concentration indices: The HH concentration indices measure the concentration, or diversification, of a country's trade in terms of either products or markets. The HH export (import) product concentration index is calculated as the sum of squared product shares in a country's exports (import) and then normalised to lie between zero and one. HH market concentration indices are calculated analogously. HH export and import product concentration indices with scores close to zero indicate a diversified, i.e. equally distributed, product portfolio and scores close to one indicate high concentration on a few products. Analogously, in the case of HH indices of export and import market concentration scores close to zero indicate that trade is diversified, i.e. equally distributed, across markets and scores close concentration on a few markets. It should be noted that the HH indices inform only about the distribution of trade but not about the underlying numbers of products and markets. The assessment of, for instance, export diversification should therefore take into account both the number of exported products and export markets and the HH indices indicating how equally distributed trade is across these products and markets. Source: Author's calculations based on UN Comtrade data.

Structure of merchandise trade provides a breakdown of merchandise exports and imports by main commodity groups according to the WTO International Trade Statistics (ITS) definitions: agricultural products refer to food (SITC Rev. 3 sections 0, 1, 4 and division 22) and raw materials (SITC Rev. 3 divisions 21, 23, 24, 25 and 26). Fuels and mining products include ores and other minerals; fuels and non-ferrous metals. Manufactures refer to iron and steel, chemicals, other semi-manufactures, machinery and transport equipment, textiles, clothing and other consumer goods. Shares sum up to 100 percent since trade flows that are not classified in any of those product groups, for instance non-monetary gold, are not taken into account in the calculation. Source: WTO Secretariat.

Structure of services trade shows the shares of travel services, transport services, goods-related services and other commercial services in commercial services exports and imports. Goods-related services, *inter alia*, include manufacturing activities on a contract basis such as processing, assembly, labelling and packing ("manufacturing services on physical inputs owned by others"). Other commercial services refer to communication, construction, insurance, financial, computer, information, other business, and cultural and recreational services, and royalties and license fees. Services trade is measured by balance of payments statistics according to the principles of BPM6. Source: WTO Secretariat.

Top 5 markets for merchandise exports and imports (%) indicate a country's top five export and import markets as recorded by customs-based statistics. Trade shares with EU member states are shown at the national level according to the national concept, which can deviate from data harmonized according to the community concept. Unspecified origins or destinations (areas n.e.s., bunkers and free zones) are not shown if they are among the top 5 markets. Source: UN Comtrade.

Top 5 merchandise imports and exports (%) refer to the percentage shares of a country's top five export and import products as recorded by customs-based statistics. Products are measured in terms of the Standard International Trade Classification, Rev.3 (SITC Rev. 3). Source: UN Comtrade.

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

Aid for trade eventually aims to achieve long-term development impacts through increased participation of countries in international trade. This section describes trends in development indicators related to human and economic development, including poverty and inequality.

Indicators and sources

Unemployment (% of total labour force) refers to the share of the labour force that is without work but available for and seeking employment. The unemployment rates are harmonized estimates of the International Labour Organization (ILO) allowing comparisons across countries and over time. Source: ILO, ILOSTAT.

Female labour force participation rate (%) captures to what extent women participate in the labour market. The indicator measures the proportion of a country's female population aged 15 and older that engages actively in the labour market, either by working or looking for work. Source: ILO, ILOSTAT.

ODA (% of gross national income): The share of net ODA in gross national income (GNI) indicates to what extent a country is dependent on development assistance. Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database.

Import duties collected (% of tax revenue): The share of import duties in tax revenue indicates to what extent a country is dependent on import duties in order to finance its government budget. Source: WB, World Development Indicators.

Total debt service (% of total exports): Total debt service is the sum of principal repayments and interest paid on long-term debt, interest paid on short-term debt, and repayments (repurchases and charges) to the IMF. Both public and private external debt is included. External indebtedness affects a country's creditworthiness and investor perceptions. The share of total debt service to total exports helps assess the sustainability of a country's debt service obligations, in particular regarding a countries' ability to obtain foreign exchange through exports. Source: WB, World Development Indicators.

Human Development Index (HDI): The HDI ranges from zero (minimum level of development) to one (maximum level of development) summarising the three basic development dimensions health, education and living standard. Source: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), International Human Development Indicators: Human Development Index.

GDP per capita, PPP (constant 2011 international $): GDP per capita is converted to international dollars using purchasing power parity rates. An international dollar has the same purchasing power over GDP as the U.S. dollar has in the United States. Number of countries included in benchmark groups: LDCs (43), LMICs (31), UMICs (51), HICs (61). Source: WB, World Development Indicators.

Economic structure: The development of a country´s economic structure is captured by the shares of agriculture, industry and services in GDP in 2006 and 2017. Source: WB, World Development Indicators.

Poverty: Population living below $1.90 ($3.20) a day measures the percentage of the population living on less than $1.90 ($3.20) a day at 2011 international prices. Source: WB, World Development Indicators.

Inequality: Income held by lowest 20% (40%) is the percentage share of income that accrues to the subgroups of population indicated by the respective quintiles. Source: WB, World Development Indicators.

Legend:

"-" Not applicable

"…" Data not available or not reported

REFERENCES

Arvis, J. F., Y. Duval, B. Shepherd and C. Utoktham (2013), "Trade costs in the developing world: 1995-2010", *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* 6309.

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Afghanistan

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	157.6	97.4	53.9	-66%
Remittances	76.3	319.7	378.2	396%
Other official flows (OOF)	15.9	79.1	76.3	379%
of which trade-related OOF	14.2	1.2	0.0	-100%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	3 668.9	4 482.6	3 858.5	5%
of which Aid for Trade	953.5	840.2	809.6	-15%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Regional integration	**2**	Export diversification	**3**	Trade facilitation

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
United States	699.3	73	United States	241.5	30
International Development Assoc.	95.3	10	Asian Development Bank	189.2	23
Canada	32.4	3	International Development Assoc.	90.2	11
United Kingdom	30.4	3	Germany	73.9	9
Germany	24.5	3	EU Institutions	65.4	8

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	5.7	. . .
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	13.5	4.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	36.6	51.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	16.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.1
Internet users	2.1	11.4


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (17), intra-regional (4), extra-regional (13)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	. . .	47
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	...	26
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	...	13
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	...	32
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	...	33

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	*N.A.*	0.796		
	Commercial services	*N.A.*	0.285		
Imports	Goods	*N.A.*	7.103		
	Commercial services	*N.A.*	1.041		

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	31
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	60
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.079
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.146
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	41
Number of import markets (max. 237)	. . .	70
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.361
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.108


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2008	%	2016	%
Pakistan	49	Pakistan	48
India	24	India	39
Russian Federation	7	Iran	3
United Arab Emirates	3	Turkey	2
Iran	3	Iraq	2

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2008	%	2016	%
Pakistan	16	Iran	19
China	14	Pakistan	18
Japan	12	China	17
Iran	6	Kazakhstan	10
Uzbekistan	6	Uzbekistan	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2008	%	2016	%
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	51	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	33
Floor coverings, etc.	28	Special transactions not classified	19
Special transactions not classified	8	Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	16
Works of art, antique etc.	6	Floor coverings, etc.	7
Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	4	Other cereals, unmilled	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2008	%	2016	%
Special transactions not classified	49	Special transactions not classified	36
Works of art, antique etc.	14	Meal, flour of wheat, meslin	10
Animal, veg. fats, oils, n.e.s.	5	Briquettes, lignite, peat	9
Meal, flour of wheat, meslin	5	Tulle, lace, embroidery, etc.	5
Rubber tyres, tubes, etc.	4	Animal, veg. fats, oils, n.e.s.	5

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.8	1.6
Female labour force participation rate (%)	43.6	48.5
ODA (% of gross national income)	40.8	18.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2015)	47.6	32.6
Total debt service (% of total exports, 2008-2017)	0.5	4.0
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.42	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960481

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Albania

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	652.4	1051.7	1119.1	72%
Remittances	1564.4	1338.9	1310.9	-16%
Other official flows (OOF)	48.0	145.6	367.8	666%
of which trade-related OOF	14.4	73.7	243.6	1587%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	341.5	360.0	271.9	-20%
of which Aid for Trade	89.3	87.3	34.0	-62%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Regional integration	2	Transport infrastructure	3	International competitiveness

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	23.6	26	Germany	9.4	28
Germany	13.4	15	EU Institutions	6.9	20
United States	9.3	10	Switzerland	6.4	19
Italy	9.3	10	United States	2.6	8
EU Institutions	9.1	10	Denmark	2.3	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	5.7	3.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-15)	7	3.3
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.0	0.6
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	94.3	97.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	69.3
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.3	10.4
Internet users	9.6	71.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (36), intra-regional (22), extra-regional (14)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	66	77
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	88	78
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	38	32
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	33	23
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	44	30

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.224	0.901	**+303%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.623	3.193	**+97%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	2.500	4.103	**+64%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.541	1.898	**+23%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	381	241
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	954	768
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.043	0.186
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.012	0.155
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	54	100
Number of import markets (max. 237)	112	133
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.532	0.298
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.115	0.108


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Italy	73	Italy	53
Greece	10	Serbia	9
Serbia	5	Spain	5
Germany	3	Greece	4
FYR Macedonia	2	Germany	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Italy	28	Italy	29
Greece	16	Turkey	8
Turkey	8	Germany	8
China	6	Greece	8
Germany	6	China	8

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Footwear	26	Special transactions not classified	38
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	13	Footwear	21
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	6	Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	8
Non-ferrous waste, scrap	5	Ore, concentrate base metals	4
Manufactures base metals, n.e.s.	4	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	8	Special transactions not classified	38
Lime, cement, construction materials	3	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Petroleum products	3
Iron, steel bar, shapes, etc.	3	Footwear	2
Medicaments	3	Leather	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	16.4	13.8
Female labour force participation rate (%)	47.4	47.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	3.5	1.2
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	2.2
Total debt service (% of total exports)	8.2	10.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.71	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960500

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Angola

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	249.3	5102.8	-2254.5	-
Remittances	82.1	15.4	1.4	-98%
Other official flows (OOF)	14.2	506.2	156.7	1006%
of which trade-related OOF	3.5	352.9	149.7	4193%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	352.5	343.2	297.5	-16%
of which Aid for Trade	31.9	85.4	12.7	-60%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Industrialization	3	Transport infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Korea	13.4	42	African Development Fund	4.1	32
Italy	2.8	9	EU Institutions	2.6	21
International Development Assoc.	2.3	7	Korea	1.6	12
Spain	2.1	7	Norway	1.2	9
EU Institutions	1.8	6	Germany	0.9	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-16)	7.2	11.4
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	9.5
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.4	0.1
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	91.9	98.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.2	14.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.3
Internet users	1.5	14.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (24), intra-regional (4), extra-regional (20)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	91	52
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	0	3
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	44	47
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2007-2015)	4	5
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2007-2015)	47	45

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	31.862	34.613	**+9%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.145	0.985	**+579%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	8.778	14.463	**+65%** ▲	
	Commercial services	6.860	12.903	**+88%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2007-2015)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	6	7
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1031	1041
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.901	0.888
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.027	0.030
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	31	40
Number of import markets (max. 237)	224	156
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.170	0.212
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.067	0.070

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2015	%
China	30	China	43
United States	25	India	8
Canada	7	Spain	7
France	6	France	5
India	5	Other Asia, nes	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2015	%
Portugal	15	China	17
Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of	9	Portugal	15
United States	9	Korea, Republic of	9
China	8	United States	7
Brazil	6	South Africa	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2015	%
Petroleum oils, crude	96	Petroleum oils, crude	95
Natural abrasives, n.e.s.	3	Natural abrasives, n.e.s.	3
Residual petrol products	2	Residual petrol products	2
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	0	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	0
Coffee, coffee substitute	0	Wood rough, rough squared	0

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2015	%
Civil engineering equipment	16	Special transactions not classified	14
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	5	Civil engineering equipment	9
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	4
Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	4	Other meat, meat offal	3
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	2	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	2

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	17.7	7.1
Female labour force participation rate (%)	75.1	75.5
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.5	0.2
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	4.4	6.4
Total debt service (% of total exports)	13.2	13.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.47	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960519

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Antigua and Barbuda

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	285.3	60.9	60.9	-79%
Remittances	20.6	27.4	32.9	59%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	14.7	35.3	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	3.9	4.2	11.0	181%
of which Aid for Trade	0.9	2.0	1.3	44%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade finance access	2	Services development	3	3. Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	0.9	98	United Arab Emirates	0.8	59
			Japan	0.3	27
			Adaptation Fund	0.2	12
			International Labour Organisation	0.0	1

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	9.7	9.9
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	16.1
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.8	1.6
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	96.7	74.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	47.1
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.7	8.8
Internet users	30.0	76.0


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (4), intra-regional (1), extra-regional (3)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	116	141
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	86	82
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	31	44
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2007-2017)	10	15
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	24	29

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.074	0.208	**+182%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.462	0.929	**+101%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.560	0.554		**-1%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.249	0.437	**+75%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	185
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	677
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.200
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.035
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	46	37
Number of import markets (max. 237)	89	100
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.151	0.131
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.225	0.272


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Neth. Antilles	31	Spain	22
United States	24	United Kingdom	21
Barbados	8	Bermuda	14
Dominica	6	United States	14
United Kingdom	4	Dominica	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	41	United States	43
Neth. Antilles	23	United Kingdom	5
Trinidad and Tobago	9	China	4
United Kingdom	3	Japan	4
Japan	3	Trinidad and Tobago	3

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	58	Ship, boat, floating structures	43
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	8	Textile articles, n.e.s.	18
Rotating electric plant	4	Alcoholic beverages	5
Gold, silverware, jewel, n.e.s.	3	Gold, silverware, jewel, n.e.s.	3
Textile articles, n.e.s.	3	Manufactures base metals, n.e.s.	2

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	36	Petroleum products	16
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	Metallic structures, n.e.s.	5
Internal combustion piston engine	2	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	2	Ship, boat, floating structures	4
Furniture, cushions, etc.	2	Other meat, meat offal	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	. . .	. . .
Female labour force participation rate (%)	. . .	. . .
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.3	0.7
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	14.5	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.77	0.8

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960538

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Bangladesh

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	848.4	2039.8	2151.6	154%
Remittances	6976.8	14619.1	13498.2	93%
Other official flows (OOF)	14.9	543.8	642.4	4225%
of which trade-related OOF	14.0	397.3	550.9	3849%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	2031.2	3208.3	4537.9	123%
of which Aid for Trade	376.2	987.2	1884.8	401%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade facilitation	**2**	Transport infrastructure	**3**	Network infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	233.8	62	Japan	1168.1	62
United Kingdom	40.1	11	International Development Assoc.	405.6	22
Germany	21.5	6	Asian Development Bank	113.7	6
Denmark	16.6	4	United States	37.0	2
Japan	14.1	4	EU Institutions	35.4	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-16)	15.2	13.9
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	10.6
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	4.9	3.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	69.3	79.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	30.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.0	4.4
Internet users	1.0	18.0


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (95), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (79)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	40	38
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	8	6
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	14	16
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2015)	17	6
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2015)	60	66

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	11.234	35.302	**+214%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.922	2.262	**+145%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	14.246	47.558	**+234%** ▲	
	Commercial services	2.309	9.011	**+290%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2015)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	502	580
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1035	1101
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.082	0.100
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.024	0.018
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	160	180
Number of import markets (max. 237)	172	164
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.116	0.084
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.064	0.083


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
United States	27	United States	19
Germany	15	Germany	15
United Kingdom	9	United Kingdom	11
China	7	Spain	6
France	6	France	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
China	16	China	22
India	12	India	12
Kuwait	9	Singapore	9
Japan	6	Hong Kong, China	5
Korea, Republic of	4	Indonesia	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	28	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	32
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	24	Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	28
Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	10	Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	13
Cotton fabrics, woven	7	Mens, boys clothing, knit	6
Mens, boys clothing, knit	5	Women, girls clothing knitted	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
Petroleum products	11	Petroleum products	9
Cotton	5	Cotton fabrics, woven	8
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5	Cotton	5
Textile, leather machines	5	Textile yarn	4
Fabrics, man-made fibres	5	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	4


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.6	4.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	27.9	35.9
ODA (% of gross national income)	1.4	1.4
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	39.9	28.9
Total debt service (% of total exports)	5.5	5.5
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.51	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960557

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Barbados

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	477.9	286.2	286.2	-40%
Remittances	109.1	108.3	111.7	2%
Other official flows (OOF)	2.4	. . .	. . .	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	. . .	. . .	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	7.9	. . .	. . .	-
of which Aid for Trade	0.0	. . .	. . .	-


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	-	2	-	3	-

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
United States	0.0				
Japan	0.0				
Korea	0.0				

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	13.5	. . .
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.3	3.7
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	97.8	66.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	45.4
Fixed broadband subscriptions	14.1	24.2
Internet users	55.3	81.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (53), intra-regional (19), extra-regional (34)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	104	88
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	76	61
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	29	25
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	26	20
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	32	29

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.510	0.803	**+57%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.579	1.273		**-19%** ▼
Imports	Goods	1.602	1.520	**+198%**	**-5%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.643	0.494	**+291%**	**-23%** ▼

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	376	372
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	903	888
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.084	0.063
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.035	0.039
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	90	85
Number of import markets (max. 237)	120	130
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.113	0.121
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.196	0.189


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	20	United States	26
Trinidad and Tobago	11	Trinidad and Tobago	8
United Kingdom	7	Jamaica	6
Saint Lucia	5	Guyana	5
Jamaica	5	Saint Lucia	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	38	United States	40
Trinidad and Tobago	22	Trinidad and Tobago	17
United Kingdom	6	China	6
Japan	4	United Kingdom	4
Canada	4	Japan	3

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	26	Petroleum products	19
Alcoholic beverages	6	Alcoholic beverages	12
Petroleum oils, crude	5	Medicaments	7
Medicaments	5	Gold, silverware, jewel, n.e.s.	4
Sugars, molasses, honey	4	Misc. manufactured goods n.e.s.	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	17	Petroleum products	19
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Medicaments	3
Medicaments	3	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	2
Automatic data processing equipment	2	Articles, n.e.s., of plastics	2

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	8.7	9.5
Female labour force participation rate (%)	64.1	62.2
ODA (% of gross national income)	-0.0	. . .
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2015)	8.4	9.7
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.77	0.8

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:

$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INEQUALITY INDICATORS


Income (%) held by:

lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960576

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Belize

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	140.5	74.8	77.0	-45%
Remittances	71.1	87.2	90.2	27%
Other official flows (OOF)	4.7	20.7	30.4	547%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	3.7	6.4	105339%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	14.3	39.1	41.4	190%
of which Aid for Trade	6.1	17.6	13.9	129%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade policy	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Services development

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	5.8	95	EU Institutions	9.3	67
Japan	0.2	4	Kuwait	2.5	18
Canada	0.0	1	Inter-American Development Bank	1.6	11
Korea	0.0	0	United States	0.3	2
Austria	0.0	0	OPEC Fund for International Development	0.1	1

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	10.8	11.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	19.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	16.2	17.7
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	63.5	55.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	47.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	2.5	5.4
Internet users	24.0	47.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (30), intra-regional (11), extra-regional (19)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	123	111
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	46	54
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	19	20
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	21	40
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	25	34

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.409	0.458	**+12%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.343	0.544	**+59%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.598	0.846	**+41%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.143	0.217	**+51%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	79	171
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	665	733
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.131	0.114
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.097	0.016
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	42	57
Number of import markets (max. 237)	71	83
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.200	0.147
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.180	0.159


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	42	United Kingdom	28
United Kingdom	16	United States	26
Costa Rica	8	Jamaica	5
Netherlands	6	Italy	5
Jamaica	4	Barbados	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	39	United States	36
Neth. Antilles	11	China	11
Panama	10	Mexico	11
Mexico	9	Curacao	8
Guatemala	6	Guatemala	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Fruit, veg. juices	20	Sugars, molasses, honey	28
Sugars, molasses, honey	19	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	15
Petroleum oils, crude	16	Fruit, veg. juices	12
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	16	Crustaceans, molluscs etc	7
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	15	Petroleum oils, crude	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	27	Petroleum products	10
Petroleum products	15	Tobacco, manufactured	5
Alcoholic beverages	2	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	3
Articles, n.e.s., of plastics	2	Articles, n.e.s., of plastics	2
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	2	Footwear	2

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	9.4	9.0
Female labour force participation rate (%)	47.1	52.9
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.7	2.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	17.6	9.7
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.70	0.7

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960595

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Benin

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	159.4	228.8	184.4	16%
Remittances	214.3	246.7	266.3	24%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	11.7	23.5	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	10.8	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	862.2	542.6	736.9	-15%
of which Aid for Trade	116.6	165.4	206.2	77%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Services development	**3**	Trade facilitation

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	29.7	26	African Development Fund	63.8	31
International Development Assoc.	23.6	20	International Development Assoc.	49.6	24
Denmark	19.0	16	EU Institutions	27.7	13
African Development Fund	18.4	16	Germany	14.1	7
France	8.0	7	France	11.4	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.0	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	12	13.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	24.3	0.4
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	24.7	93.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	12.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.3
Internet users	1.5	14.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (55), intra-regional (22), extra-regional (33)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	45	67
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	21	13
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	25	16
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	74	74
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	33	33

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.735	2.216	**+201%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.196	0.323	**+64%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.042	3.066	**+194%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.346	0.577	**+67%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	120	241
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	580	675
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.194	0.243
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.050	0.146
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	64	79
Number of import markets (max. 237)	99	118
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.078	0.070
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.054	0.077


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
China	24	Viet Nam	14
Nigeria	9	Bangladesh	13
India	9	Malaysia	11
Niger	7	India	10
Cote d'Ivoire	6	Nigeria	10

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	17	India	19
China	9	Thailand	14
Cote d'Ivoire	7	China	8
Ghana	7	Netherlands	7
United Kingdom	6	Togo	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Cotton	40	Cotton	48
Tobacco, manufactured	16	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	13
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	7	Fixed veg. fat, oils, soft	3
Lime, cement, construction materials	4	Oilseed (other fixed veg. oil)	3
Fixed veg. fat, oils, soft	4	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	15	Rice	35
Rice	11	Petroleum products	12
Electric current	6	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	7
Lime, cement, construction materials	5	Electric current	4
Worn clothing, textile articles	4	Other meat, meat offal	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	0.8	2.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	67.8	69.0
ODA (% of gross national income)	7.8	7.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	26.5	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	4.2	4.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.45	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960614

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Bhutan

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	40.8	12.0	10.3	-75%
Remittances	2.9	22.8	43.2	1384%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	3.7	4.8	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	3.6	4.2	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	84.9	106.2	132.2	56%
of which Aid for Trade	26.4	57.9	53.9	104%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Trade policy	**3**	Services development

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	10.7	41	Asian Development Bank	22.9	42
International Development Assoc.	6.0	23	Japan	20.3	38
Switzerland	1.7	6	Australia	4.0	7
Global Environment Facility	1.6	6	International Development Assoc.	3.4	6
Austria	1.5	6	Austria	1.5	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-15)	22.1	22.3
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-14)	9.3	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-14)	40.3	96.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.3	87.4
Fixed broadband subscriptions (08-17)	0.3	2.1
Internet users	4.5	48.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (16), intra-regional (8), extra-regional (8)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	95	77
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	12	22
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	12	17
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	48	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s)	55	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.312	0.555	**+78%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.042	0.160	**+280%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.435	1.025	**+136%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.061	0.203	**+232%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	108	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	618	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.111	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.027	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	14	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	41	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.592	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.470	...


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
India	77		
Hong Kong, China	15		
Singapore	3	...	
Bangladesh	3		
Thailand	2		

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
India	69		
Indonesia	7		
Russian Federation	5	...	
Singapore	3		
Korea, Republic of	2		

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Electric current	27		
Musical instruments, etc.	19		
Copper	8	...	
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	7		
Wire products excl. electrical wiring	6		

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	13		
Copper	9		
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	7	...	
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3		
Iron, steel bar, shapes, etc.	3		


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.1	2.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	65.5	58.0
ODA (% of gross national income)	10.3	5.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	4.3	3.1
Total debt service (% of total exports)	2.8	10.5
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.52	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960633

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Brunei Darussalam

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	338.9	197.2	-46.3	-
Remittances	...	...	...	-
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
of which Aid for Trade	0.0	0.0	0.0	-


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Connecting to value chains	**3**	International competitiveness

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	3.3	0.3
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	1.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.2	0.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	72.6	100.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	3.3	126.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	2.4	9.6
Internet users	42.2	94.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (40), intra-regional (12), extra-regional (28)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	96	85
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	9	9
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	39	28
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	1	6
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	48	52

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	7.627	5.474		-28% ▼
	Commercial services	0.745	0.533		-28% ▼
Imports	Goods	1.588	3.072	+93% ▲	
	Commercial services	1.035	1.220	+18% ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2007-2017)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	335	378
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	906	896
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.525	0.405
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.018	0.019
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	49	57
Number of import markets (max. 237)	67	99
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.163	0.146
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.107	0.122

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Japan	31	Japan	29
Indonesia	20	Korea, Republic of	14
Korea, Republic of	15	Malaysia	11
Australia	12	Thailand	11
United States	7	India	10

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Malaysia	22	China	21
Singapore	17	Singapore	18
Japan	13	Malaysia	18
United States	9	United States	9
China	8	Germany	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	67	Natural gas	50
Natural gas	29	Petroleum oils, crude	40
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	1	Alcohol, phenol, etc.	3
Women, girls clothing knitted	1	Misc. manufactured goods n.e.s.	2
Metal removal work tools	0	Misc. chemical products, n.e.s.	1

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	9	Petroleum products	9
Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	5	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6
Cotton fabrics, woven	3	Internal combustion piston engine	5
Medicaments	3	Metallic structures, n.e.s.	4
Engines, motors non-electric	3	Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	4

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	5.7	9.3
Female labour force participation rate (%)	56.2	58.4
ODA (% of gross national income)	. . .	. . .
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.84	0.9

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960652

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Burkina Faso

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	161.0	326.0	485.9	202%
Remittances	83.9	392.5	444.3	430%
Other official flows (OOF)	4.2	31.6	104.7	2398%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	20.7	83.6	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1346.6	1115.0	1005.9	-25%
of which Aid for Trade	196.2	336.6	319.1	63%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Connecting to value chains	**2**	Network infrastructure	**3**	Industrialization

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	62.0	32	International Development Assoc.	89.1	28
International Development Assoc.	48.3	25	EU Institutions	62.3	20
France	35.6	18	France	40.8	13
African Development Fund	12.6	6	African Development Fund	30.9	10
Denmark	8.2	4	Germany	16.3	5

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.0	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	9.8
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	26.8	0.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	25.2	99.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	28.8
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.1
Internet users	0.6	15.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (46), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (30)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	36	67
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	8	12
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	24	29
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2007-2017)	92	91
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2007-2017)	39	40

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.607	3.242	**+434%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.055	0.456	**+725%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.090	3.248	**+198%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.346	1.354	**+291%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2007-2017)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	193	236
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	724	752
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.462	0.430
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.049	0.056
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	50	68
Number of import markets (max. 237)	101	122
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.114	0.361
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.067	0.053


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Switzerland	28	Switzerland	59
France	14	India	10
Belgium	10	Singapore	9
Ghana	9	Cote d'Ivoire	7
Singapore	7	France	3

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Cote d'Ivoire	17	China	14
France	15	Cote d'Ivoire	11
China	8	France	9
United States	7	Netherlands	7
India	6	United States	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Cotton	67	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	64
Oilseed (other fixed veg. oil)	8	Cotton	13
Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	6	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	6
Live animals	2	Zinc	6
Tobacco, manufactured	2	Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	20	Petroleum products	22
Rice	4	Civil engineering equipment	5
Medicaments	4	Lime, cement, construction materials	4
Lime, cement, construction materials	4	Medicaments	4
Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	3	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.7	6.0
Female labour force participation rate (%)	61.2	58.6
ODA (% of gross national income)	15.5	7.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	17.5	15.7
Total debt service (% of total exports)	6.1	3.7
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.33	0.4


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960671

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Burundi

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	1.5	18.2	0.3	-78%
Remittances	1.3	46.2	33.7	2524%
Other official flows (OOF)	21.0	0.2	21.1	1%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	21.1	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	492.0	568.8	458.2	-7%
of which Aid for Trade	75.0	111.0	79.0	5%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Regional integration	**2**	Services development	**3**	

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	35.2	47	African Development Fund	19.8	25
EU Institutions	24.7	33	International Development Assoc.	18.4	23
Belgium	4.9	7	Netherlands	14.6	19
Netherlands	2.0	3	Belgium	10.0	13
African Development Fund	1.8	2	EU Institutions	9.8	12

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.7	12.8
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	15.3
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.5	0.6
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	94.0	94.8
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	12.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions (08-17)	0.0	0.0
Internet users	0.7	5.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (25), intra-regional (8), extra-regional (17)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	39	32
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	9	9
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	44	25
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	60	68
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	36	44

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.059	0.173	**+194%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.006	0.017	**+210%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.245	0.626	**+156%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.193	0.206	**+7%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	91	97
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	532	617
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.178	0.159
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.031	0.048
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	50	46
Number of import markets (max. 237)	86	89
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.139	0.104
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.051	0.062

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United Arab Emirates	32	United Arab Emirates	26
Kenya	14	Congo, Dem. Rep. of	18
Pakistan	13	Pakistan	9
Japan	7	Switzerland	6
Switzerland	7	Germany	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Belgium	11	India	14
Japan	11	China	14
Kenya	7	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	9
United Kingdom	5	Tanzania	8
Russian Federation	4	United Arab Emirates	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	37	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	25
Coffee, coffee substitute	16	Coffee, coffee substitute	25
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	14	Tea and mate	19
Aircraft, associated equipment	8	Meal, flour of wheat, meslin	5
Arms and ammunition	7	Ore, concentrate base metals	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Alcoholic beverages	11	Petroleum products	19
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	8	Medicaments	6
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	8	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	4
Arms and ammunition	5	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Aircraft, associated equipment	5	Rice	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.8	1.5
Female labour force participation rate (%)	81.7	80.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	34.2	12.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	20.4	14.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.35	0.4


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960690

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Cambodia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	742.5	2050.7	2784.4	275%
Remittances	185.8	1162.8	1294.7	597%
Other official flows (OOF)	10.2	114.5	182.4	1696%
of which trade-related OOF	5.2	81.5	171.1	3179%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	580.5	807.8	952.0	64%
of which Aid for Trade	123.8	257.8	339.0	174%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	E-commerce	**3**	Industrialization

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	50.7	41	Asian Development Bank	107.1	32
Korea	11.8	10	Japan	97.5	29
International Development Assoc.	10.0	8	Korea	47.8	14
Germany	9.6	8	Australia	19.0	6
Australia	9.5	8	OPEC Fund for Internal Development	12.9	4

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	14.3	11.1
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	9.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	10.6	3.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	35.0	78.8
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.0	66.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.8
Internet users	0.5	34.0


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (59), intra-regional (15), extra-regional (44)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	144	153
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	26	28
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	14	15
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	22	13
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	62	64

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	3.692	11.224	**+204%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.272	4.391	**+245%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	4.771	15.502	**+225%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.760	2.699	**+255%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	238	386
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	759	936
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.139	0.069
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.059	0.027
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	101	130
Number of import markets (max. 237)	86	105
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.312	0.080
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.122	0.196

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
United States	53	United States	21
Hong Kong, China	15	United Kingdom	9
Germany	7	Germany	9
United Kingdom	4	Japan	8
Singapore	4	Canada	7

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Hong Kong, China	18	China	37
China	18	Thailand	15
Thailand	14	Viet Nam	11
Other Asia, nes	13	Other Asia, nes	6
Viet Nam	9	Singapore	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	28	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	24
Women, girls clothing knitted	26	Women, girls clothing knitted	22
Printed matter	18	Mens, boys clothing, knit	15
Mens, boys clothing, knit	16	Footwear	8
Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	2	Cycles, motorcycles, etc.	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Knit, crochet, fabric, n.e.s.	19	Knit, crochet, fabric, n.e.s.	18
Fabrics, man-made fibres	13	Petroleum products	7
Petroleum products	7	Fabrics, man-made fibres	7
Cycles, motorcycles, etc.	4	Cycles, motorcycles, etc.	4
Tobacco, manufactured	3	Cotton fabrics, woven	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.3	1.1
Female labour force participation rate (%)	78.1	75.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	6.8	4.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	25.2	15.8
Total debt service (% of total exports)	0.6	3.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.50	0.6

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960709

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Cape Verde

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	176.8	139.3	108.6	-39%
Remittances	143.5	199.0	210.6	47%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	27.5	35.4	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	14.8	10.3	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	180.4	189.6	146.8	-19%
of which Aid for Trade	61.7	60.8	26.6	-57%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Industrialization	**3**	Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Portugal	20.9	34	France	12.3	46
EU Institutions	9.3	15	Japan	6.2	23
International Development Assoc.	9.2	15	EU Institutions	3.7	14
United States	8.1	13	Spain	1.0	4
Spain	4.2	7	International Development Assoc.	1.0	4

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-15)	10.4	10.0
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-14)	. . .	10.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.2	0.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	96.9	96.9
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	69.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.4	2.7
Internet users	6.8	57.2


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (6), intra-regional (1), extra-regional (5)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	113	112
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	81	77
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	32	29
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	8	1
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	35	33

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.086	0.188	**+119%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.365	0.614	**+68%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.545	0.837	**+54%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.251	0.342	**+36%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2007-2017)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	141	21
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	688	723
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.273	0.311
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.021	0.015
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	32	13
Number of import markets (max. 237)	74	93
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.114	0.527
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.212	0.213

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Cote d'Ivoire	26	Spain	71
Portugal	17	Portugal	25
Netherlands	12	United States	2
United Kingdom	9	Angola	0
Spain	9	Italy	0

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Portugal	44	Portugal	43
Netherlands	9	Spain	13
Brazil	6	Italy	6
Spain	6	China	5
Italy	5	Netherlands	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	48	Fish etc. prepared, preserved, n.e.s.	55
Trailers, semi-trailers, etc	12	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	18
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	10	Footwear	7
Ship, boat, floating structures	5	Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	7
Internal combustion piston engine	3	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	8	Petroleum products	9
Lime, cement, construction materials	5	Aircraft, associated equipment	4
Milk and cream	4	Milk and cream	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Lime, cement, construction materials	3
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Rice	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	11.0	12.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	55.2	64.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	13.1	7.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	22.1	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	6.4	5.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.61	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960728

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for the Central African Republic

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	69.5	4.6	17.2	-75%
Remittances	...	...	...	-
Other official flows (OOF)	25.1	0.0	0.0	-100%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	228.9	549.8	530.7	132%
of which Aid for Trade	34.2	22.6	11.4	-67%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Network infrastructure	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Transport infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	12.1	36	EU Institutions	5.0	44
France	9.8	29	France	3.2	28
United States	7.6	22	International Development Assoc.	1.8	15
Germany	2.4	7	Global Environment Facility	0.9	8
EU Institutions	1.8	5	Italy	0.3	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-17)	18.0	18.0
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	21	17.4
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.6	2.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	98.2	89.1
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	4.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	. . .	...
Internet users	0.3	4.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (16), intra-regional (6), extra-regional (10)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%, 2006-2016)	34	38
Commercial services as % of total exports (%, 2006-2016)	12	34
Commercial services as % of total imports (%, 2006-2016)	37	39
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	91	31
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	93	30

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.158	0.104		-34% ▼
	Commercial services	0.022	0.053	+139% ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.203	0.310	+53% ▲	
	Commercial services	0.120	0.196	+64% ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	17	58
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	19	427
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.412	0.090
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.308	0.023
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	32	36
Number of import markets (max. 237)	34	81
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.157	0.377
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.153	0.094


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Belgium	27	France	61
Germany	9	Benin	10
Israel	8	China	7
Cameroon	6	Chad	5
France	6	Pakistan	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Belgium	21	France	26
Germany	8	Cameroon	12
Israel	7	Belgium	8
France	5	China	7
Cameroon	5	Japan	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Pearls, precious stones	48	Trailers, semi-trailers, etc	20
Natural abrasives, n.e.s.	16	Arms and ammunition	18
Wood, simply worked	15	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	15
Wood rough, rough squared	12	Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	13
Special transactions not classified	9	Wood rough, rough squared	9

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Pearls, precious stones	38	Arms and ammunition	9
Wood rough, rough squared	23	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	8
Wood, simply worked	19	Medicaments	6
Natural abrasives, n.e.s.	12	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5
Special transactions not classified	7	Rotating electric plant	4


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	7.0	6.5
Female labour force participation rate (%)	65.7	64.8
ODA (% of gross national income)	9.2	26.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2008-2017)	19.6	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.33	0.4


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960747

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Chad

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	-44.6	42.8	335.0	-
Remittances	...	...	...	-
Other official flows (OOF)	6.3	20.3	13.1	108%
of which trade-related OOF	5.1	0.0	0.0	-100%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	391.2	755.2	674.3	72%
of which Aid for Trade	50.2	72.1	35.5	-29%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Transport infrastructure	**3**	Trade finance access

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	29.9	60	International Development Assoc.	7.9	22
International Development Assoc.	11.6	23	France	6.6	19
Switzerland	3.0	6	African Development Fund	6.4	18
African Development Fund	2.7	5	Switzerland	5.4	15
France	1.6	3	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	4.0	11

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-16)	18.0	17.9
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	14.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.5	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	94.7	98.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	22.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	. . .	0.1
Internet users	0.6	6.5


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (49), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (33)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%, 2006-2015)	94	65
Commercial services as % of total exports (%, 2006-2015)	2	7
Commercial services as % of total imports (%, 2006-2015)	60	64
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	3.375	2.628	**-22%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.080	0.187	**+134%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.429	1.536	**+7%** ▲	
	Commercial services	2.124	2.717	**+28%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE

Exports

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Imports

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Other commercial services
Travel
Transport
Goods-related services

Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE

Exports 2006

2017

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Imports 2006

2017

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Agriculture
Fuels and mining
Manufacturing

Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.4	2.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	63.9	64.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	4.7	6.6
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.33	0.4

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960766

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Colombia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	8733.5	13917.2	14518.0	66%
Remittances	4395.4	4580.3	5527.3	26%
Other official flows (OOF)	814.2	2233.9	1225.3	50%
of which trade-related OOF	314.1	1171.3	910.5	190%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	918.1	1290.8	932.8	2%
of which Aid for Trade	124.0	203.9	162.7	31%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Industrialization	**3**	3. Connecting to value chains

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
United States	89.3	72	United States	70.6	43
Spain	11.6	9	EU Institutions	17.9	11
Netherlands	7.3	6	Canada	12.2	7
EU Institutions	3.4	3	Finland	10.0	6
France	3.3	3	Germany	9.5	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.5	5.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	7.3
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	5.7	0.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	91.0	94.7
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	2.4	48.8
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.4	12.9
Internet users	15.3	62.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (92), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (75)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	37	33
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	13	17
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	19	22
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	34	27
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	53	48

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	25.166	39.676	**+58%** ▲	
	Commercial services	3.675	8.171	**+122%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	24.810	44.247	**+78%** ▲	
	Commercial services	5.973	12.296	**+106%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	946	949
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1143	1135
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.063	0.129
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.010	0.014
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	157	175
Number of import markets (max. 237)	151	159
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.191	0.104
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.100	0.126

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	41	United States	29
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	11	Panama	7
Ecuador	5	China	5
Peru	3	Netherlands	4
Dominican Republic	2	Mexico	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	27	United States	26
Mexico	9	China	19
China	8	Mexico	7
Brazil	7	Brazil	5
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	6	Germany	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	19	Petroleum oils, crude	29
Coal, not agglomerated	12	Coal, not agglomerated	18
Petroleum products	7	Coffee, coffee substitute	7
Coffee, coffee substitute	7	Petroleum products	5
Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	5	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	6	Petroleum products	8
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Hydrocarbons, n.e.s., derivatives	3	Medicaments	3
Automatic data processing equipment	3	Automatic data processing equipment	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	11.5	8.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	52.1	58.6
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.6	0.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2008-2016)	8.9	4.6
Total debt service (% of total exports)	34.0	41.6
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.69	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960785

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Comoros

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	4.4	5.9	8.6	97%
Remittances	79.3	128.4	138.4	74%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	0.2	0.0	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	40.0	68.1	71.0	78%
of which Aid for Trade	3.6	13.3	22.4	519%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**		**3**	

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
France	2.0	55	International Development Assoc.	14.5	65
EU Institutions	0.9	24	EU Institutions	2.9	13
International Development Assoc.	0.5	14	Arab Fund (AFESD)	1.8	8
Belgium	0.1	3	African Development Fund	1.7	8
UNDP	0.1	2	France	0.2	1

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	28.9	15.4
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.6	0.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	82.5	93.8
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	37.8
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.0	0.2
Internet users	2.2	8.5


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (15), intra-regional (6), extra-regional (9)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%, 2006-2015)	30	37
Commercial services as % of total exports (%, 2006-2015)	76	83
Commercial services as % of total imports (%, 2006-2015)	35	31
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)	2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	0.013	0.016	**+20%** ▲	
	0.043	0.080	+88% ▲	
Imports	0.101	0.185	**+83%** ▲	
	0.054	0.082	**+52%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	9	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	44	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.258	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.142	...


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	53		
India	17		
Germany	11	...	
United Arab Emirates	7		
Singapore	7		

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United Arab Emirates	31		
France	21		
South Africa	9	...	
India	6		
China	5		

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Spices	86		
Essential oil, perfume, flavour	8		
Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	3	...	
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	1		
Special transactions not classified	0		

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Trailers, semi-trailers, etc	14		
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	7		
Lime, cement, construction materials	7	...	
Rice	6		
Petroleum products	6		


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	4.2	3.7
Female labour force participation rate (%)	33.8	37.2
ODA (% of gross national income)	7.9	10.2
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	5.9	1.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.46	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960804

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Democratic Republic of Congo

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	1263.7	1573.8	1340.2	6%
Remittances	12.1	838.8	1273.8	10427%
Other official flows (OOF)	30.5	36.0	1.8	-94%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	35.6	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1842.6	2483.3	2462.0	34%
of which Aid for Trade	200.5	497.9	429.0	114%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Trade facilitation	3	Cross-border infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	120.6	60	International Development Assoc.	169.1	39
EU Institutions	36.5	18	African Development Fund	75.4	18
Belgium	15.5	8	EU Institutions	65.5	15
United Kingdom	8.8	4	Belgium	30.8	7
Germany	6.3	3	United Kingdom	22.5	5

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-15)	12.0	10.9
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.4	1.7
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	98.7	51.8
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	16.2
Fixed broadband subscriptions	. . .	0.0
Internet users	0.3	8.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (63), intra-regional (20), extra-regional (43)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	46	74
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	7	0
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	21	12
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	2.705	13.280	**+391%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.219	0.059		**-73%** ▼
Imports	Goods	2.892	12.870	**+345%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.763	1.779	**+133%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.9	4.1
Female labour force participation rate (%)	69.2	61.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	15.7	6.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	33.3	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	9.2	3.0
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.37	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960823

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Costa Rica

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	2037.0	2739.9	3007.1	48%
Remittances	578.6	563.8	563.5	-3%
Other official flows (OOF)	22.6	384.4	464.0	1956%
of which trade-related OOF	20.2	274.9	304.8	1412%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	96.8	116.4	126.6	31%
of which Aid for Trade	41.2	45.2	53.1	29%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Transport infrastructure	2	Trade facilitation	3	E-commerce

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	19.0	46	Japan	35.3	66
Germany	9.9	24	EU Institutions	12.1	23
France	7.0	17	Inter-American Development Bank	1.6	3
EU Institutions	1.8	4	France	1.5	3
Spain	1.2	3	Korea	0.9	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-17)	5.9	5.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	5.3
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	7.3	1.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	86.7	90.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	7.4	97.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.9	15.2
Internet users	25.1	71.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (66), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (49)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	90	67
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	36	45
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	16	20
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	59	40
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	59	43

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	6.311	10.808	**+71%** ▲	
	Commercial services	3.549	8.673	**+144%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	8.843	15.150	**+71%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.652	3.688	**+123%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	736	774
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1042	1083
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.056	0.065
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.039	0.015
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	110	132
Number of import markets (max. 237)	126	137
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.200	0.181
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.175	0.183

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	42	United States	41
China	8	Belgium	6
Hong Kong, China	7	Netherlands	6
Netherlands	7	Panama	5
Panama	3	Nicaragua	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	40	United States	38
Japan	5	China	13
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	5	Mexico	7
Mexico	5	Guatemala	3
China	5	Germany	3

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Transistors, valves, etc.	17	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	20
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	16	Medical instruments, n.e.s.	18
Parts, for office machines	9	Misc. manufactured goods n.e.s.	6
Medical instruments, n.e.s.	8	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	5
Coffee, coffee substitute	3	Coffee, coffee substitute	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Transistors, valves, etc.	17	Petroleum products	8
Petroleum products	9	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5
Electric switch relay circuit	4	Medicaments	4
Medicaments	3	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3
Paper and paperboard	3	Articles, n.e.s., of plastics	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	5.7	8.1
Female labour force participation rate (%)	44.6	45.4
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.2	0.2
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	6.6	4.3
Total debt service (% of total exports)	7.6	14.8
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.73	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960861

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Côte d'Ivoire

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	397.3	503.4	674.7	70%
Remittances	183.5	355.0	379.3	107%
Other official flows (OOF)	86.9	131.8	153.5	77%
of which trade-related OOF	1.7	107.4	105.1	6204%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	479.5	1064.3	1361.7	184%
of which Aid for Trade	96.0	189.6	212.8	122%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	International competitiveness	3	Cross-border infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	76.2	79	International Development Assoc.	82.6	39
EU Institutions	12.2	13	EU Institutions	47.4	22
France	3.8	4	African Development Fund	41.4	19
Belgium	1.1	1	Japan	26.4	12
Japan	0.7	1	Korea	2.8	1

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.0	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	8.1
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	3.5	1.5
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	87.0	90.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	53.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	0.6
Internet users	1.5	43.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (80), intra-regional (22), extra-regional (58)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	93	65
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	9	7
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	30	27
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	42	63
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	28	36

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	8.362	11.853	**+42%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.815	0.869	**+7%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	5.209	8.487	**+63%** ▲	
	Commercial services	2.239	3.180	**+42%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	465	586
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	905	961
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.103	0.108
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.101	0.025
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	128	148
Number of import markets (max. 237)	122	152
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.063	0.044
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.144	0.053


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	18	Netherlands	12
Netherlands	10	United States	9
United States	9	Viet Nam	6
Nigeria	7	France	5
Germany	4	Germany	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Nigeria	28	China	13
France	26	France	11
China	4	Nigeria	9
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	3	Spain	9
Germany	3	India	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Cocoa	24	Cocoa	38
Petroleum products	20	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	11
Petroleum oils, crude	16	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	7
Arms and ammunition	4	Natural rubber, etc.	7
Natural rubber, etc.	4	Petroleum products	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	30	Petroleum oils, crude	8
Arms and ammunition	5	Petroleum products	7
Rice	5	Ship, boat, floating structures	6
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	4	Rice	6
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	5


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	5.7	2.5
Female labour force participation rate (%)	48.3	48.2
ODA (% of gross national income)	1.5	2.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	29.9	13.6
Total debt service (% of total exports)	2.8	17.6
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.42	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960880

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Dominican Republic

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	1874.0	2273.4	3570.0	91%
Remittances	3352.1	5171.7	6177.8	84%
Other official flows (OOF)	80.4	495.4	168.1	109%
of which trade-related OOF	45.6	152.8	45.9	1%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	229.0	276.2	185.2	-19%
of which Aid for Trade	53.8	46.0	27.0	-50%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade policy	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	3. Other (MSMEs, women, youth, etc.)

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	15.2	28	EU Institutions	21.3	79
Germany	7.3	14	United States	1.5	5
United States	6.0	11	Inter-American Development Bank	1.1	4
Japan	5.9	11	Japan	1.1	4
France	5.6	10	Korea	0.9	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	8.5	7.3
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	7.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	9.0	1.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	54.1	88.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	2.5	51.3
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.1	7.6
Internet users	14.8	65.0


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (65), intra-regional (18), extra-regional (47)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	51	52
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	77	46
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	14	16
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	35	45
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	53	42

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.931	10.121	**+424%** ▲	
	Commercial services	6.560	8.476	**+29%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	9.559	17.700	**+85%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.510	3.354	**+122%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	478	768
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1043	1062
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.048	0.056
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.009	0.017
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	106	123
Number of import markets (max. 237)	140	162
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.562	0.304
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.293	0.224


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	67	United States	53
Haiti	5	Haiti	10
Korea, Republic of	3	Canada	9
Netherlands	2	India	7
Canada	2	Switzerland	3

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	53	United States	44
China	7	China	13
Brazil	4	Mexico	5
Japan	3	Brazil	3
Spain	3	Spain	3

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	13	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	18
Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	12	Medical instruments, n.e.s.	9
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	9	Tobacco, manufactured	9
Medical instruments, n.e.s.	9	Electric switch relay circuit	5
Gold, silverware, jewel, n.e.s.	8	Medicaments	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6	Petroleum products	10
Cotton fabrics, woven	4	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Electric switch relay circuit	3	Articles, n.e.s., of plastics	3
Medicaments	3	Medicaments	3
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	2	Liquefied propane, butane	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	5.7	5.8
Female labour force participation rate (%)	41.0	50.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.2	0.2
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	9.9	5.8
Total debt service (% of total exports)	15.2	15.6
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.68	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960899

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Ecuador

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	507.5	950.0	606.4	19%
Remittances	3121.3	2490.7	2849.1	-9%
Other official flows (OOF)	37.8	888.3	631.8	1570%
of which trade-related OOF	12.7	564.2	351.5	2668%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	277.0	308.4	261.5	-6%
of which Aid for Trade	39.8	139.7	68.5	72%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Regional integration	2	Export diversification	3	Trade finance access

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Spain	14.4	36	EU Institutions	20.3	30
Belgium	5.6	14	Korea	11.3	16
Switzerland	3.2	8	France	10.6	15
United States	2.9	7	Germany	9.0	13
Japan	2.8	7	Spain	5.7	8

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	11.7	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	9.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	10.0	2.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	82.6	50.3
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	8.9	53.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.3	10.1
Internet users	7.2	57.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (73), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (56)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	59	42
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	7	10
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	17	14
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	9	14
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	41	49

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	13.170	19.612	**+49%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.965	2.177	**+126%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	11.402	19.301	**+69%** ▲	
	Commercial services	2.271	3.198	**+41%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	615	648
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1057	1062
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.313	0.163
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.024	0.018
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	127	148
Number of import markets (max. 237)	103	141
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.300	0.121
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.083	0.090

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	54	United States	32
Peru	8	Viet Nam	8
Colombia	6	Peru	7
Chile	4	Chile	6
Italy	3	Panama	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	23	United States	20
Colombia	13	China	19
Brazil	7	Colombia	8
China	7	Panama	4
Chile	4	Brazil	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	54	Petroleum oils, crude	32
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	10	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	16
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	5	Crustaceans, molluscs etc	16
Fish etc. prepared, preserved, n.e.s.	4	Fish etc. prepared, preserved, n.e.s.	6
Petroleum products	4	Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	11	Petroleum products	9
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5	Residual petrol products	6
Residual petrol products	5	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	4	Medicaments	4
Petroleum gases, n.e.s.	4	Animal feed stuff	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.6	3.8
Female labour force participation rate (%)	53.7	56.6
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.5	0.2
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	30.7	29.3
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.70	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960918

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for El Salvador

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	898.3	350.1	791.9	-12%
Remittances	3648.8	4350.8	5054.0	39%
Other official flows (OOF)	43.7	170.2	215.8	394%
of which trade-related OOF	7.7	98.5	129.3	1578%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	229.8	168.9	217.2	-5%
of which Aid for Trade	51.0	28.6	33.2	-35%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade facilitation	2	Regional integration	3	Transport infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	27.8	54	United States	10.5	32
Spain	9.9	19	Germany	7.2	22
United States	3.7	7	Japan	3.6	11
EU Institutions	3.1	6	Korea	2.2	7
Germany	2.7	5	Inter-American Development Bank	2.0	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-17)	5.9	6.0
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	7.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	10.1	2.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	43.2	95.9
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	2.3	56.1
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.0	6.9
Internet users	5.5	31.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (59), intra-regional (15), extra-regional (44)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	70	75
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	40	35
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	16	16
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	30	32
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	46	44

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	2.255	4.662	**+107%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.477	2.492	**+69%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	6.339	9.499	**+50%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.205	1.829	**+52%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	659	708
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1019	1031
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.044	0.033
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.015	0.015
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	90	102
Number of import markets (max. 237)	105	119
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.309	0.246
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.145	0.140


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	53	United States	45
Guatemala	13	Honduras	14
Honduras	11	Guatemala	14
Nicaragua	5	Nicaragua	7
Costa Rica	3	Costa Rica	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	36	United States	32
Guatemala	8	China	14
Mexico	7	Guatemala	10
China	4	Mexico	8
Brazil	4	Honduras	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	25	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	21
Women, girls clothing knitted	5	Mens, boys clothing, knit	6
Coffee, coffee substitute	5	Clothing accessories, fabric	5
Mens, boys clothing, knit	5	Articles, n.e.s., of plastics	5
Alcohol, phenol, etc.	4	Sugars, molasses, honey	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	8	Petroleum products	10
Knit, crochet, fabric, n.e.s.	6	Textile yarn	4
Petroleum oils, crude	5	Medicaments	3
Special transactions not classified	3	Knit, crochet, fabric, n.e.s.	3
Medicaments	3	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	6.6	4.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	46.2	45.9
ODA (% of gross national income)	1.0	0.6
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	8.0	4.8
Total debt service (% of total exports)	31.6	20.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.66	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960937

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Equatorial Guinea

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	306.1	151.7	304.1	-1%
Remittances	...	...	...	-
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	7.1	8.9	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	33.6	10.7	11.8	-65%
of which Aid for Trade	0.5	0.1	0.3	-27%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	**2**	Connecting to value chains	**3**	E-commerce

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Spain	0.3	66	International Labour Organisation	0.0	4
EU Institutions	0.1	28	Spain	0.0	0
Japan	0.0	6			
UNDP	0.0	0			

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-17)	18.0	...
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	...	...
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-17)	0.1	...
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-17)	95.9	...
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	0.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.1
Internet users	1.3	26.2


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (39), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (30)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%, 2006-2016)	110	70
Commercial services as % of total exports (%, 2006-2016)	0	6
Commercial services as % of total imports (%, 2006-2016)	29	41
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	8.235	4.145		**-50%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.023	0.281	**+1131%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	2.021	2.043	**+1%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.845	1.415	**+67%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE

Exports

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Imports

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Other commercial services
Travel
Transport
Goods-related services

Source: WTO Secretariat

Note: For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE

Exports 2006

2017

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Imports 2006

2017

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Agriculture
Fuels and mining
Manufacturing

Source: WTO Secretariat

Note: Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	8.2	9.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	52.4	55.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.3	0.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2015)	2.0	3.5
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.58	0.6

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960956

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Ethiopia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	291.9	2823.5	3586.4	1129%
Remittances	305.6	1218.5	393.0	29%
Other official flows (OOF)	6.9	26.6	187.8	2608%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	26.3	184.4	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	3940.0	3734.7	4278.8	9%
of which Aid for Trade	497.8	827.1	917.1	84%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	**2**	Export diversification	**3**	Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	133.3	27	International Development Assoc.	358.4	39
International Development Assoc.	124.9	25	African Development Fund	147.5	16
Italy	63.5	13	EU Institutions	64.9	7
African Development Fund	49.4	10	France	51.3	6
Germany	39.3	8	United States	46.8	5

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-15)	16.8	17.4
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-14)	. . .	10.6
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-14)	2.1	0.1
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-14)	89.8	98.3
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.1	14.1
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.1
Internet users	0.3	18.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (74), intra-regional (21), extra-regional (53)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	47	31
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	45	52
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	22	25
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	53	60
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	38	49

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.056	3.030	**+187%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.859	3.264	**+280%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	4.106	14.235	**+247%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.154	4.844	**+320%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	181	377
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	920	992
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.203	0.203
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.049	0.019
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	87	127
Number of import markets (max. 237)	148	132
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.050	0.042
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.067	0.122


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Germany	13	United States	10
China	10	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	10
Japan	8	Germany	9
Switzerland	6	Switzerland	8
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	6	China	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	18	China	32
China	12	United States	9
Italy	8	India	7
United Arab Emirates	8	Kuwait	6
India	6	Japan	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Coffee, coffee substitute	41	Coffee, coffee substitute	42
Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	16	Veg.	15
Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	12	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	7
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	6	Other meat, meat offal	6
Veg.	5	Leather	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Petroleum products	20	Petroleum products	10
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	8	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	5
Civil engineering equipment	4	Aircraft, associated equipment	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Medicaments	3
Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	2	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.3	1.8
Female labour force participation rate (%)	74.3	74.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	13.4	5.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	59.9	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	5.9	20.8
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.36	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960975

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Gabon

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	579.6	1093.0	1498.0	158%
Remittances	17.5	...	...	-
Other official flows (OOF)	23.7	82.8	831.2	3413%
of which trade-related OOF	9.5	36.1	78.0	717%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	91.0	102.0	142.4	57%
of which Aid for Trade	23.5	44.8	8.7	-63%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Cross-border infrastructure	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Services development

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
France	13.0	55	France	3.8	44
EU Institutions	8.4	36	EU Institutions	2.7	31
Japan	1.9	8	African Development Bank	1.1	13
Belgium	0.1	0	Japan	0.9	10
United States	0.0	0	Canada	0.1	1

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-16)	18.0	17.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	...	...
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.0	0.5
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	99.9	86.8
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	84.1
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	0.7
Internet users	5.5	50.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (74), intra-regional (24), extra-regional (50)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%, 2006-2015)	87	74
Commercial services as % of total exports (%, 2006-2015)	2	6
Commercial services as % of total imports (%, 2006-2015)	44	40
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	12	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s)	45	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	6.056	5.590		**-8%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.121	0.357	**+194%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.561	2.777	**+78%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.207	1.792	**+48%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	184	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	817	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.715	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.011	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	91	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	102	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.356	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.184	...


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	58		
China	11		
France	7	...	
Singapore	5		
Switzerland	3		

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	40		
Belgium	14		
United States	7	...	
Cameroon	3		
Japan	3		

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	84		
Wood rough, rough squared	5		
Ore, concentrate base metals	3	...	
Veneers, plywood, etc.	2		
Wood, simply worked	1		

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	6		
Civil engineering equipment	4		
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	...	
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3		
Petroleum products	3		


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	17.0	19.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	37.5	43.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.3	0.8
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports, 2007-2017)	12.1	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.65	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933960994

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Gambia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	76.3	6.8	87.5	15%
Remittances	61.4	160.4	228.2	272%
Other official flows (OOF)	69.4	15.9	10.9	-84%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	5.2	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	147.4	115.7	291.7	98%
of which Aid for Trade	15.1	37.5	80.3	431%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Network infrastructure	**2**	Transport infrastructure	**3**	Connecting to value chains

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	4.4	29	International Development Assoc.	33.9	42
African Development Fund	4.0	26	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	21.3	27
International Development Assoc.	3.3	22	African Development Fund	12.8	16
Japan	1.6	11	EU Institutions	8.3	10
Belgium	0.5	3	Kuwait	1.9	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	. . .	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	14.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	15.1	0.4
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	36.7	92.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.5	27.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.0	0.2
Internet users	5.2	19.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (24), intra-regional (8), extra-regional (16)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	79	55
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	46	51
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	30	22
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	56	55
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	37	39

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.109	0.129	**+18%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.092	0.136	**+47%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.222	0.426	**+92%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.094	0.122	**+30%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	46
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	445
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.117
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.126
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	21	31
Number of import markets (max. 237)	53	79
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.313	0.197
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.063	0.126

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United Kingdom	49	Viet Nam	36
Senegal	32	Mali	28
France	5	Guinea-Bissau	9
Germany	3	China	5
Morocco	2	India	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Denmark	17	Cote d'Ivoire	29
United States	12	Senegal	18
China	9	China	8
Cote d'Ivoire	9	Brazil	6
Germany	8	Spain	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	48	Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	32
Veg.	22	Milk and cream	10
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	7	Fabrics, man-made fibres	7
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6	Crustaceans, molluscs etc	7
Worn clothing, textile articles	2	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	7

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	17	Petroleum products	30
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	10	Stone, sand and gravel	15
Sugars, molasses, honey	6	Rice	8
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	5	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	6
Rice	4	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	9.2	8.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	48.9	51.6
ODA (% of gross national income)	11.9	27.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	33.5	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	14.8	16.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.42	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961013

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Georgia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	1497.8	1691.1	1861.9	24%
Remittances	858.5	1655.3	1793.9	109%
Other official flows (OOF)	19.3	465.7	451.3	2239%
of which trade-related OOF	19.3	347.5	313.4	1524%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	545.8	599.3	571.8	5%
of which Aid for Trade	146.0	249.8	199.4	37%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1		2		3	

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
United States	63.2	43	EU Institutions	114.9	58
International Development Assoc	55.1	38	Japan	15.6	8
Germany	18.3	13	United States	15.2	8
Sweden	2.0	1	Asian Development Bank	12.8	6
Netherlands	1.8	1	Germany	11.7	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	7.0	1.5
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	1.9
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	7.1	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	95.0	96.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	5.8	66.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.6	19.7
Internet users	7.5	60.5


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (63), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (54)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	87	111
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	34	52
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	16	20
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	55	50
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	31	35

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.586	3.570	**+125%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.829	3.892	**+369%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	3.643	7.374	**+102%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.693	1.898	**+174%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	409	606
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	954	978
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.043	0.057
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.028	0.019
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	82	106
Number of import markets (max. 237)	101	112
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.053	0.054
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.069	0.059


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Turkey	13	Russian Federation	15
Azerbaijan	9	Azerbaijan	10
Russian Federation	8	Turkey	8
Armenia	8	Armenia	8
Turkmenistan	8	China	7

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Russian Federation	15	Turkey	17
Turkey	14	Russian Federation	10
Germany	10	China	9
Azerbaijan	9	Azerbaijan	7
Ukraine	8	Ukraine	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	10	Copper ores, concentrates	15
Copper ores, concentrates	9	Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	11
Alcoholic beverages	8	Alcoholic beverages	11
Ferrous waste and scrap	8	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	9
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	7	Medicaments	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	12	Petroleum products	9
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	8	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6
Natural gas	6	Medicaments	4
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Copper ores, concentrates	4
Medicaments	3	Natural gas	4


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	13.6	13.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	54.9	57.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	4.5	3.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	6.2	0.8
Total debt service (% of total exports)	10.7	29.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.72	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961032

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Grenada

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	127.1	79.4	79.4	-38%
Remittances	28.6	43.0	45.9	60%
Other official flows (OOF)	5.1	13.9	8.4	66%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	4.0	6.3	14310%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	16.5	33.6	20.0	21%
of which Aid for Trade	0.9	8.9	3.6	287%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade policy	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	0.7	76	International Development Assoc.	1.8	51
Japan	0.2	19	Kuwait	1.2	32
Canada	0.1	6	Germany	0.4	10
United Kingdom	0.0	2	Korea	0.1	2
Korea	0.0	1	Australia	0.1	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-16)	10.2	11.0
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.5	0.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	92.9	100.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	89.2
Fixed broadband subscriptions	5.4	20.6
Internet users	21.4	59.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (30), intra-regional (14), extra-regional (16)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	80	105
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	80	94
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	25	38
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	36	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s)	38	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.032	0.035	**+8%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.129	0.546	**+324%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.297	0.370	**+24%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.101	0.229	**+126%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

PRODUCT DIVERSIFICATION (BASED ON HS02, 4-DIG.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	...	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	...	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	...	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	...	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	28	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	85	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.094	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.194	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.067	0.053

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	28		
Saint Lucia	13		
Dominica	10	...	
Saint Kitts and Nevis	7		
Trinidad and Tobago	7		

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	39		
Trinidad and Tobago	19		
United Kingdom	6	...	
China	5		
Japan	4		

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Meal, flour of wheat, meslin	16		
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	14		
Spices	11	...	
Paper, paperboard, cut etc.	9		
Animal feed stuff	7		

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Printed matter	8		
Petroleum products	6		
Medicaments	3	...	
Metallic structures, n.e.s.	3		
Wood, simply worked	3		

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	...	...
Female labour force participation rate (%)	...	...
ODA (% of gross national income)	4.0	0.5
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	13.1	...
Total debt service (% of total exports)	8.6	9.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.73	0.8

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:

$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INEQUALITY INDICATORS


Income (%) held by:

lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961051

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Guatemala

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	696.9	1264.8	1146.7	65%
Remittances	4132.0	6627.4	8449.2	104%
Other official flows (OOF)	156.8	253.9	205.8	31%
of which trade-related OOF	73.3	46.7	175.1	139%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	538.3	363.9	435.2	-19%
of which Aid for Trade	26.8	57.3	47.9	79%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Network infrastructure	**2**	Cross-border infrastructure	**3**	Other (MSMEs, women, youth, etc.)

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Spain	5.0	19	United States	20.7	43
EU Institutions	4.7	18	EU Institutions	11.6	24
Japan	4.4	16	Inter-American Development Bank	2.8	6
Netherlands	3.1	11	Sweden	2.7	6
United States	2.3	9	Canada	2.5	5

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-15)	5.6	5.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-14)	. . .	4.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	8.6	1.9
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	54.3	96.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	3.6	16.5
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.3	3.1
Internet users	6.5	40.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (63), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (46)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	67	45
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	19	20
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	14	16
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	53	46
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	40	43

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	6.082	11.100	**+83%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.410	2.772	**+97%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	10.934	17.110	**+56%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.756	3.204	**+82%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	856	865
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1075	1059
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.043	0.025
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.035	0.017
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	109	130
Number of import markets (max. 237)	102	114
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.136	0.146
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.166	0.177


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
United States	31	United States	34
El Salvador	15	El Salvador	11
Honduras	10	Honduras	9
Mexico	5	Nicaragua	5
Nicaragua	4	Mexico	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
United States	39	United States	39
Mexico	9	Mexico	11
China	5	China	11
Brazil	4	El Salvador	5
Panama	4	Costa Rica	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Coffee, coffee substitute	15	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	11
Sugars, molasses, honey	11	Sugars, molasses, honey	8
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	8	Coffee, coffee substitute	6
Petroleum oils, crude	7	Women, girls clothing knitted	5
Natural rubber, etc.	3	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Petroleum products	17	Petroleum products	11
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Medicaments	3
Paper and paperboard	2	Paper and paperboard	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.9	2.7
Female labour force participation rate (%)	41.5	41.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	1.7	0.5
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	9.6	4.3
Total debt service (% of total exports)	15.8	28.6
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.58	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961070

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Guinea

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	255.6	574.2	576.5	126%
Remittances	35.4	101.4	43.8	24%
Other official flows (OOF)	12.4	1.9	21.0	70%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.2	2.8	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	328.0	594.9	496.8	51%
of which Aid for Trade	45.4	66.9	120.2	164%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Trade finance access

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	14.6	32	International Development Assoc.	36.9	31
International Development Assoc.	7.5	17	EU Institutions	34.6	29
African Development Fund	6.8	15	African Development Fund	20.8	17
France	6.7	15	Japan	7.6	6
Japan	3.4	8	United States	6.2	5

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-17)	11.9	12.1
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	10.9
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.6	1.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	60.8	84.9
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	24.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	. . .	0.0
Internet users	0.6	11.4


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (47), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (31)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	54	85
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	4	1
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	20	18
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2015)	73	90
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2015)	37	33

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.033	4.595	**+345%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.038	0.052	**+39%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.951	3.484	**+266%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.238	0.755	**+217%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2015)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	73	158
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	630	707
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.373	0.300
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.080	0.041
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	51	69
Number of import markets (max. 237)	90	118
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.102	0.098
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.058	0.066


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
Other Europe, nes	13	Ghana	22
Spain	12	India	16
United States	10	United Arab Emirates	10
Ireland	9	Spain	9
Germany	8	Germany	7

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
Cote d'Ivoire	16	China	15
France	10	Netherlands	13
India	8	India	11
China	8	Belgium	8
Belgium	7	France	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
Aluminium ores and concentrates	56	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	40
Special transactions not classified	25	Aluminium ores and concentrates	37
Cocoa	6	Printed matter	8
Coffee, coffee substitute	2	Ship, boat, floating structures	5
Wood, simply worked	2	Natural rubber, etc.	2

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
Petroleum products	24	Petroleum products	15
Rice	13	Rice	11
Civil engineering equipment	5	Medicaments	6
Tobacco, manufactured	4	Ship, boat, floating structures	5
Lime, cement, construction materials	3	Civil engineering equipment	4


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	4.0	3.6
Female labour force participation rate (%)	62.9	64.0
ODA (% of gross national income)	4.3	4.4
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	15.9	1.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.38	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961089

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Guinea-Bissau

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	13.7	23.8	16.6	21%
Remittances	39.3	77.9	103.6	163%
Other official flows (OOF)	4.4	0.5	0.0	-100%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	121.6	138.1	120.3	-1%
of which Aid for Trade	33.2	10.8	27.7	-17%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Network infrastructure	3	Transport infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	23.5	71	International Development Assoc.	10.0	36
International Development Assoc.	5.1	15	EU Institutions	8.3	30
African Development Fund	1.5	4	African Development Fund	3.2	12
Spain	1.4	4	United Arab Emirates	2.2	8
Portugal	0.5	1	Adaptation Fund	2.1	8

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.0	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	26.5	24.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	4.7	7.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	8.5
Fixed broadband subscriptions	. . .	0.0
Internet users	2.1	3.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (0), intra-regional (0), extra-regional (0)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	41	61
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	4	9
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	24	35
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2005-2017)	1	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2005-2017)	21	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.074	0.339	**+358%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.003	0.032	**+836%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.127	0.291	**+129%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.040	0.154	**+290%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	6	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	22	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.720	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.284	...


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	4.2	4.0
Female labour force participation rate (%)	65.3	67.2
ODA (% of gross national income)	15.1	8.4
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	12.6	2.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.40	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:

$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INEQUALITY INDICATORS


Income (%) held by:

lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961108

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Honduras

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	867.7	1253.4	1185.7	37%
Remittances	2597.8	3633.7	4322.8	66%
Other official flows (OOF)	17.7	130.7	78.4	343%
of which trade-related OOF	3.9	130.1	74.9	1812%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	915.5	586.2	531.6	-42%
of which Aid for Trade	72.8	191.9	162.2	123%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade facilitation	2	Cross-border infrastructure	3	Connecting to value chains

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	26.4	36	Inter-American Development Bank	63.5	39
United States	18.5	25	EU Institutions	36.3	22
Japan	10.1	14	Korea	22.7	14
Spain	6.5	9	United States	17.0	10
Germany	3.3	5	Spain	7.5	5

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-15)	5.6	5.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-14)	. . .	6.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	11.5	0.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	38.9	99.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.2	24.5
Fixed broadband subscriptions	. . .	2.6
Internet users	7.8	32.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (60), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (44)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	94	79
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	46	38
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	16	18
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	64	69
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	40	41

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	2.109	4.596	**+118%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.810	2.816	**+56%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	5.219	8.785	**+68%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.027	1.874	**+83%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	548	616
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	999	988
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.079	0.092
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.045	0.026
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	82	106
Number of import markets (max. 237)	103	121
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.284	0.192
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.216	0.160


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	52	United States	40
Germany	8	Germany	8
Belgium	6	Belgium	7
Mexico	5	Netherlands	6
El Salvador	4	El Salvador	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	45	United States	35
Guatemala	7	China	15
Mexico	5	Guatemala	9
Panama	5	Mexico	7
El Salvador	4	El Salvador	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Coffee, coffee substitute	21	Coffee, coffee substitute	26
Electric distribution equipment, n.e.s.	14	Electric distribution equipment, n.e.s.	9
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	10	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	8
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	9	Crustaceans, molluscs etc	7
Tobacco, manufactured	3	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	7

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	20	Petroleum products	14
Medicaments	3	Medicaments	4
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	2
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Animal feed stuff	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.6	4.1
Female labour force participation rate (%)	40.2	47.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	5.0	2.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2015)	7.5	4.4
Total debt service (% of total exports)	7.9	23.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.59	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961127

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Indonesia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	7053.7	14124.4	23063.1	227%
Remittances	6230.3	9039.0	9011.3	45%
Other official flows (OOF)	1261.4	5020.4	2507.1	99%
of which trade-related OOF	662.6	3464.0	1967.3	197%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	2953.9	2088.6	2474.9	-16%
of which Aid for Trade	755.8	657.7	1184.4	57%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Transport infrastructure	2	Services development	3	3Industrialization

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	524.6	69	Japan	405.8	34
Germany	55.9	7	France	336.7	28
Australia	38.8	5	Germany	254.7	22
International Development Assoc.	34.9	5	Australia	59.3	5
United Kingdom	25.2	3	United States	24.0	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	6.9	8.1
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	5	5.3
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	2.5	3.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	71.3	73.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	18.5	98.3
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	2.4
Internet users	4.8	32.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (107), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (91)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	54	37
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	10	12
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	24	18
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	50	52
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	48	59

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	98.251	168.854	**+72%** ▲	
	Commercial services	11.157	24.072	**+116%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	66.053	150.069	**+127%** ▲	
	Commercial services	21.342	32.513	**+52%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	...	1040
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	...	1183
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.031
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.014
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	211	210
Number of import markets (max. 237)	177	194
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.087	0.063
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.066	0.089


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Japan	22	China	14
United States	11	United States	11
Singapore	9	Japan	11
China	8	India	8
Korea, Republic of	8	Singapore	8

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Singapore	16	China	23
China	11	Singapore	11
Japan	9	Japan	10
United States	7	Thailand	6
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	6	Malaysia	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Natural gas	10	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	13
Petroleum oils, crude	8	Coal, not agglomerated	11
Coal, not agglomerated	6	Natural gas	5
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	6	Petroleum oils, crude	3
Copper ores, concentrates	5	Natural rubber, etc.	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	18	Petroleum products	9
Petroleum oils, crude	13	Petroleum oils, crude	5
Hydrocarbons, n.e.s., derivatives	3	Parts, for office machines	3
Ship, boat, floating structures	2	Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	2
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	2	Liquefied propane, butane	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	7.6	4.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	45.5	52.2
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.3	0.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2008-2016)	3.5	2.5
Total debt service (% of total exports)	25.7	34.0
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.64	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961146

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Iraq

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	1070.2	-8002.2	-5032.4	-
Remittances	154.3	906.8	1034.9	571%
Other official flows (OOF)	210.5	1176.5	199.2	-5%
of which trade-related OOF	16.2	396.4	151.5	832%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	9294.7	1715.5	2938.2	-68%
of which Aid for Trade	1710.1	254.1	364.2	-79%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	WTO accession	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Services development

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
United States	1666.1	97	Japan	238.4	65
United Kingdom	19.1	1	Italy	114.0	31
Korea	8.5	0	EU Institutions	3.4	1
International Development Assoc.	4.1	0	Netherlands	2.0	1
Australia	3.3	0	Norway	0.9	0

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	...	...
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	...	...
Exports: weighted avg. faced	...	...
Exports: duty free (value in %)	...	...
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	41.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	...
Internet users	1.0	49.4


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (8), intra-regional (3), extra-regional (5)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	84	58
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	1	9
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	21	33
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	0	0
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2007-2017)	0	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	30.529	57.559	**+89%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.353	5.653	**+1500%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	18.708	32.186	**+72%** ▲	
	Commercial services	5.030	16.158	**+221%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	...	17
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	...	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.993
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	...	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	...	10
Number of import markets (max. 237)	...	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.752
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
		Singapore	0
		United Arab Emirates	0
...		Italy	0
		Lebanon	0
		Iran	0

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Petroleum oils, crude	97	Petroleum oils, crude	100
Petroleum products	2	Petroleum products	0
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	0	Hides, skins (excl. furs), raw	0
Hydrocarbons, n.e.s., derivatives	0	Crude animal materials, n.e.s.	0
Furniture, cushions, etc.	0	Leather	0

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	39		
Petroleum products	23		
Tobacco, manufactured	12	...	
Articles of rubber, n.e.s.	9		
Natural gas	4		


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	9.1	7.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	11.9	12.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	13.5	1.5
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	...	14.1
Total debt service (% of total exports)	...	...
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.64	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961165

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Kazakhstan

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	10573.0	6787.7	4633.7	-56%
Remittances	117.4	232.8	355.0	202%
Other official flows (OOF)	116.4	1855.8	789.7	578%
of which trade-related OOF	110.1	1286.4	564.7	413%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	197.3	119.7	110.5	-44%
of which Aid for Trade	91.6	23.9	7.8	-92%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Other (MSMEs, women, youth, etc.)	**3**	Industrialization

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
United States	64.4	70	Germany	1.8	23
Germany	16.4	18	United States	1.7	22
Japan	4.0	4	Korea	1.4	19
EU Institutions	2.3	3	Asian Development Bank	0.9	11
Korea	1.1	1	Japan	0.6	8

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	. . .	6.5
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	5.9
Exports: weighted avg. faced (06-16)	. . .	1.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (06-16)	. . .	79.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	22.6	76.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.2	14.2
Internet users	3.3	76.4


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (65), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (56)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	91	60
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	6	11
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	26	25
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	29	34
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	39	46

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	38.761	49.455	**+28%** ▲	
	Commercial services	2.584	6.201	**+140%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	24.070	32.107	**+33%** ▲	
	Commercial services	8.672	10.724	**+24%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	648	823
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1066	1126
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.389	0.312
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.013	0.006
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	104	107
Number of import markets (max. 237)	131	143
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.089	0.070
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.165	0.183


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Italy	18	Italy	18
Switzerland	18	China	12
Russian Federation	10	Netherlands	10
China	9	Russian Federation	9
France	9	Switzerland	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Russian Federation	38	Russian Federation	39
China	8	China	16
Germany	8	Germany	5
Italy	6	United States	4
United States	5	Italy	3

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	62	Petroleum oils, crude	55
Copper	7	Copper	5
Petroleum products	3	Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	5
Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	2	Natural gas	3
Zinc	2	Radio-active materials	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	6	Petroleum products	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3
Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	4	Medicaments	3
Petroleum products	3	Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	3
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Ore, concentrate base metals	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	7.8	4.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	64.7	65.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.3	0.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	5.3
Total debt service (% of total exports)	33.5	47.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.75	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961184

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Kenya

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	548.7	611.3	671.7	22%
Remittances	627.7	1584.9	1962.3	213%
Other official flows (OOF)	41.4	397.9	228.6	452%
of which trade-related OOF	32.5	385.8	187.8	478%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1346.7	2775.8	2945.7	119%
of which Aid for Trade	285.0	934.7	932.3	227%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	**2**	Trade policy	**3**	Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	83.9	29	International Development Assoc.	321.5	34
Japan	35.7	13	African Development Fund	162.0	17
France	29.9	10	Japan	116.4	12
EU Institutions	28.1	10	EU Institutions	81.6	9
African Development Fund	17.5	6	United States	55.3	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.7	12.8
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-17)	6	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.5	1.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	86.3	87.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.2	34.1
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.6
Internet users	3.6	17.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (105), intra-regional (33), extra-regional (72)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	52	36
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	36	40
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	16	15
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	31	29
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	40	46

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	3.509	5.792	**+65%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.987	3.785	**+91%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	6.752	15.994	**+137%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.252	2.847	**+127%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	881	845
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1023	1034
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.054	0.079
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.039	0.030
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	153	151
Number of import markets (max. 237)	136	142
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.053	0.045
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.048	0.077


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Uganda	11	Pakistan	11
United Kingdom	11	Uganda	10
United States	8	United States	8
Netherlands	8	Netherlands	7
Tanzania	7	United Kingdom	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United Arab Emirates	15	China	23
India	7	India	10
South Africa	7	United Arab Emirates	8
China	6	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	7
Japan	6	Japan	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Tea and mate	19	Tea and mate	25
Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	11	Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	11
Petroleum products	7	Petroleum products	6
Veg.	6	Coffee, coffee substitute	4
Coffee, coffee substitute	4	Veg.	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	13	Petroleum products	15
Petroleum oils, crude	11	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	4
Aircraft, associated equipment	8	Sugars, molasses, honey	4
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	3	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Railway vehicles equipment	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	9.4	9.3
Female labour force participation rate (%)	60.4	63.6
ODA (% of gross national income)	3.7	3.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2015)	. . .	7.2
Total debt service (% of total exports)	7.1	14.8
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.51	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961203

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Kiribati

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	0.2	1.4	1.4	803%
Remittances	13.8	16.8	18.4	33%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.5	0.2	0.1	-73%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.2	0.1	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	26.2	69.2	77.5	195%
of which Aid for Trade	9.3	32.7	29.3	216%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Transport infrastructure	**2**	Network infrastructure	**3**	Trade policy

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	8.3	90	International Development Assoc.	8.8	30
EU Institutions	0.4	4	Asian Development Bank	8.7	30
New Zealand	0.3	3	Japan	5.7	19
Australia	0.2	2	New Zealand	3.1	11
Korea	0.1	1	Australia	2.1	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	17.5	...
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	...	...
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-17)	1.3	...
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-17)	62.5	...
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	32.2
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.4	0.1
Internet users	4.5	14.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (8), intra-regional (7), extra-regional (1)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%, 2006-2016)	88	101
Commercial services as % of total exports (%, 2006-2016)	69	48
Commercial services as % of total imports (%, 2006-2016)	30	33
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2007-2016)	74	45
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	28	36

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.003	0.010	**+219%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.007	0.010	**+35%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.061	0.107	**+77%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.026	0.053	**+103%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2007-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	20	36
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	320	391
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.242	0.158
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.073	0.022
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	9	19
Number of import markets (max. 237)	33	29
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.301	0.159
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.245	0.101

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2016	%
Australia	45	Malaysia	33
Other Asia, nes	21	United States	21
Singapore	14	Fiji	15
Hong Kong, China	10	New Zealand	14
Fiji	5	Japan	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Australia	36	Australia	22
Fiji	35	Fiji	22
New Zealand	7	China	10
Japan	6	New Zealand	8
United States	4	Singapore	8

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2016	%
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	49	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	31
Fish, dried, salted, smoked	13	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	26
Manufactures base metals, n.e.s.	8	Petroleum products	12
Animal feed stuff	8	Oilseed (other fixed veg. oil)	10
Oilseed (other fixed veg. oil)	7	Other machinery, parts, specialized industries	7

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Petroleum products	25	Petroleum products	7
Rice	8	Rice	7
Tobacco, manufactured	4	Tobacco, manufactured	6
Alcoholic beverages	3	Stone, sand and gravel	4
Sugars, molasses, honey	3	Sugars, molasses, honey	4


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	. . .	. . .
Female labour force participation rate (%)	. . .	. . .
ODA (% of gross national income)	16.0	22.2
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	9.1
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.58	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962495

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Kyrgyz Republic

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	255.6	668.6	93.8	-63%
Remittances	800.1	1975.0	2485.8	211%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.1	54.4	23.8	18191%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	49.2	12.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	226.7	616.4	544.9	140%
of which Aid for Trade	52.0	136.9	129.2	148%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade policy	**2**	Services development	**3**	Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	13.1	25	Asian Development Bank	54.8	42
United States	11.7	22	Japan	17.4	13
Switzerland	5.8	11	International Development Assoc.	16.7	13
Germany	5.7	11	United States	15.4	12
Japan	5.3	10	Switzerland	10.4	8

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	4.8	6.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	6.4
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	2.4	0.7
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	66.7	95.1
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.5	73.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	4.3
Internet users	12.3	38.2


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (48), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (39)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	124	101
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	28	32
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	20	18
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	56	65
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	32	37

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.906	1.749	**+93%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.351	0.816	**+132%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.792	4.159	**+132%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.455	0.901	**+98%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	438	453
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	792	926
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.097	0.171
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.069	0.023
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	62	72
Number of import markets (max. 237)	87	97
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.149	0.140
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.177	0.198


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Switzerland	26	Switzerland	28
Kazakhstan	20	Kazakhstan	15
Russian Federation	19	Russian Federation	15
Afghanistan	9	United Kingdom	11
China	5	Uzbekistan	8

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Russian Federation	38	China	33
China	14	Russian Federation	27
Kazakhstan	12	Kazakhstan	12
United States	6	Turkey	5
Uzbekistan	4	Uzbekistan	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	26	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	40
Petroleum products	15	Precious metal ores, concentrates	9
Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	5	Aircraft, associated equipment	4
Cotton	5	Veg.	4
Lime, cement, construction materials	4	Women, girls clothing knitted	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	25	Petroleum products	12
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5	Footwear	7
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Fabrics, man-made fibres	6
Sugars, molasses, honey	3	Medicaments	4
Medicaments	3	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	8.3	6.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	54.4	48.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	9.7	6.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	17.6
Total debt service (% of total exports)	7.6	29.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.62	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961222

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Lao People's Democratic Republic

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	246.2	945.7	813.0	230%
Remittances	9.4	188.9	252.8	2587%
Other official flows (OOF)	23.3	56.0	52.9	127%
of which trade-related OOF	12.5	35.3	52.7	323%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	304.9	502.3	563.6	85%
of which Aid for Trade	113.4	168.9	208.3	84%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	International competitiveness	**3**	Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	32.2	28	Japan	48.2	23
International Development Assoc.	21.6	19	International Development Assoc.	40.4	19
France	12.4	11	Asian Development Bank	29.8	14
Sweden	10.5	9	Korea	23.8	11
Germany	10.4	9	Thailand	18.7	9

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-17)	9.7	8.5
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	7.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	2.2	1.9
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	60.7	93.9
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.1	40.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.4
Internet users	1.2	25.5


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (38), intra-regional (11), extra-regional (27)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	63	74
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	19	15
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	3	17
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	...	60
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	...	47

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.882	4.823	**+447%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.203	0.878	**+333%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.060	5.636	**+432%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.031	1.140	**+3598%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	...	330
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	...	879
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.084
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.035
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	...	67
Number of import markets (max. 237)	...	59
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.250
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.420

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
		China	36
		Thailand	31
...		Viet Nam	17
		India	3
		Japan	2

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
		Thailand	62
		China	18
...		Viet Nam	10
		Japan	2
		Korea, Republic of	2

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
		Copper ores, concentrates	23
		Copper	12
...		Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	7
		Sound recorder, phonograph	5
		Non-alcohol beverages, n.e.s.	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
		Petroleum products	13
		Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	9
...		Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	6
		Non-alcohol beverages, n.e.s.	4
		Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	4


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.1	0.6
Female labour force participation rate (%)	77.6	76.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	9.4	3.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2008-2017)	11.7	8.9
Total debt service (% of total exports)	16.7	13.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.51	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961241

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Lesotho

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	58.2	154.3	135.0	132%
Remittances	609.3	369.2	401.0	-34%
Other official flows (OOF)	-0.4	5.3	0.0	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	118.9	125.7	175.2	47%
of which Aid for Trade	17.5	13.0	9.7	-44%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	E-commerce	**2**	Regional integration	**3**	Export diversification

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	6.7	38	International Development Assoc.	4.1	42
African Development Fund	6.1	35	African Development Fund	2.4	24
EU Institutions	3.1	17	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	2.2	23
Germany	0.7	4	EU Institutions	0.7	7
United States	0.2	1	Germany	0.2	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	7.9	7.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	12.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.0	0.5
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	99.9	98.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.8	49.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.0	0.2
Internet users	3.0	29.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (14), intra-regional (4), extra-regional (10)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	137	124
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	5	3
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	21	15
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	...	23
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s)	...	59

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.718	1.028	+43% ▲	
	Commercial services	0.035	0.031	-12%	-12% ▼
Imports	Goods	1.359	1.826	+34% ▲	
	Commercial services	0.358	0.319		-11% ▼

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	...	254
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	...	827
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.069
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.032
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	...	48
Number of import markets (max. 237)	...	57
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.438
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.576

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2008	%	2017	%
South Africa	83	South Africa	49
United States	15	United States	45
Madagascar	1	Eswatini	2
Kenya	1	Germany	1
Canada	0	Canada	1

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2008	%	2017	%
South Africa	95	South Africa	71
Japan	2	China	15
Germany	1	Other Asia, nes	5
United States	1	India	3
United Kingdom	0	Japan	2

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2008	%	2017	%
Television receivers etc.	21	Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	18
Electric switch relay circuit	18	Women, girls clothing knitted	15
Footwear	7	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	15
Wool, other animal hair	6	Mens, boys clothing, knit	11
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	6	Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	7

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2008	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	13	Manufactures base metals, n.e.s.	12
Petroleum products	7	Residual petrol products	9
Perfumery, cosmetics, etc.	4	Petroleum products	7
Misc. manufactured goods n.e.s.	4	Knit, crochet, fabric, n.e.s.	5
Road motor vehicles n.e.s.	4	Cotton fabrics, woven	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	30.3	23.6
Female labour force participation rate (%)	63.4	59.8
ODA (% of gross national income)	3.2	5.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	...	...
Total debt service (% of total exports)	3.1	3.6
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.47	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961260

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Liberia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	174.4	452.3	247.8	42%
Remittances	66.3	582.2	403.5	509%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.9	66.3	198.6	23015%
of which trade-related OOF	0.9	66.3	198.6	23015%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	991.9	905.3	629.1	-37%
of which Aid for Trade	67.0	219.6	227.6	240%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Transport infrastructure	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Export diversification

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	49.8	74	United States	76.6	34
United States	8.4	12	International Development Assoc.	58.8	26
Norway	2.8	4	African Development Fund	25.1	11
Sweden	2.5	4	Japan	19.0	8
EU Institutions	1.8	3	Germany	18.5	8

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-14)	. . .	10.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (06-16)	. . .	1.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (06-16)	. . .	91.7
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	11.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions (08-17)	0.0	0.2
Internet users (07-17)	0.6	8.0


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (44), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (35)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	85	49
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	48	5
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	33	18
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.155	0.368	**+138%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.143	0.021		**-85%** ▼
Imports	Goods	0.441	0.998	**+126%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.217	0.217	**+0%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.2	2.0
Female labour force participation rate (%)	53.2	54.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	57.7	33.5
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	42.8	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	0.4	3.5
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.38	0.4


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961279

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Madagascar

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	809.2	400.0	389.1	-52%
Remittances	239.6	323.5	342.8	43%
Other official flows (OOF)	165.2	9.9	44.4	-73%
of which trade-related OOF	164.9	9.9	12.6	-92%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1667.1	676.5	830.6	-50%
of which Aid for Trade	280.0	142.2	205.6	-27%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Connecting to value chains	2	Trade facilitation	3	E-commerce

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	118.6	42	International Development Assoc.	95.8	47
EU Institutions	81.0	29	African Development Fund	45.7	22
France	32.7	12	EU Institutions	35.3	17
African Development Fund	12.0	4	Germany	14.2	7
United States	10.4	4	France	5.8	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	13.3	11.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	8.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.3	0.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	99.3	97.3
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	13.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.1
Internet users	0.6	9.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (68), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (51)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	67	73
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	37	31
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	29	25
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	25	35
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	50	46

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.969	2.804	**+189%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.558	1.244	**+123%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.534	3.254	**+112%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.633	1.089	**+72%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	427	424
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	870	925
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.046	0.092
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.037	0.027
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	108	124
Number of import markets (max. 237)	117	127
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.212	0.104
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.089	0.071


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	40	France	23
United States	15	United States	19
Germany	6	Germany	7
Italy	4	China	6
United Kingdom	3	Netherlands	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
China	18	China	21
Bahrain, Kingdom of	16	United Arab Emirates	8
France	13	India	7
South Africa	6	France	7
United States	4	South Africa	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	13	Spices	33
Special transactions not classified	10	Nickel	12
Petroleum products	8	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	8
Spices	8	Misc. non-ferrous base metals	5
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	8	Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	18	Petroleum products	13
Textile yarn	6	Rice	7
Cotton fabrics, woven	4	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	4
Knit, crochet, fabric, n.e.s.	3	Cotton fabrics, woven	3
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.5	1.7
Female labour force participation rate (%)	84.9	83.5
ODA (% of gross national income)	14.4	7.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	3.6	3.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.48	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961298

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Malawi

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	118.5	404.0	277.1	134%
Remittances	17.5	38.1	40.9	134%
Other official flows (OOF)	531.3	0.9	44.1	-92%
of which trade-related OOF	1.7	0.1	20.9	1097%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1643.7	1137.3	1568.9	-5%
of which Aid for Trade	103.8	240.8	445.6	329%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Transport infrastructure	3	Industrialization

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	28.5	27	International Development Assoc.	151.4	34
EU Institutions	23.5	23	United States	119.6	27
Japan	12.4	12	EU Institutions	38.2	9
Norway	11.2	11	African Development Fund	34.1	8
African Development Fund	9.6	9	Japan	30.7	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	13.5	12.4
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	8.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	14.7	12.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	85.7	90.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.6	25.5
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.0	0.1
Internet users	0.4	13.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (55), intra-regional (13), extra-regional (42)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	52	58
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	8	11
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	11	12
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	77	82
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	49	53

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.721	1.106	**+53%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.062	0.130	**+109%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.161	2.144	**+85%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.142	0.301	**+112%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	253	257
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	798	852
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.387	0.369
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.028	0.022
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	96	100
Number of import markets (max. 237)	98	110
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.086	0.069
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.156	0.073


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
South Africa	22	Belgium	22
United Kingdom	13	South Africa	8
Germany	10	Tanzania	8
United States	8	Germany	6
Egypt	5	Egypt	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
South Africa	36	South Africa	18
Mozambique	13	China	15
United Arab Emirates	6	India	11
United Kingdom	6	United Arab Emirates	7
India	4	United Kingdom	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Tobacco, unmanufactured	61	Tobacco, unmanufactured	60
Tea and mate	7	Tea and mate	8
Sugars, molasses, honey	6	Animal feed stuff	7
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	2	Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	5
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	2	Sugars, molasses, honey	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	11	Petroleum products	9
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	11	Printed matter	8
Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	6	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	6
Tobacco, unmanufactured	4	Medicaments	5
Printed matter	4	Wheat, meslin, unmilled	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	7.1	5.5
Female labour force participation rate (%)	74.0	72.8
ODA (% of gross national income)	18.3	24.6
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	8.8
Total debt service (% of total exports)	8.9	5.7
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.39	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961317

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Maldives

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	136.3	362.7	517.5	280%
Remittances	5.7	3.6	4.0	-29%
Other official flows (OOF)	24.3	1.5	9.9	-59%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	31.4	38.6	59.6	90%
of which Aid for Trade	4.1	9.4	29.6	629%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	International competitiveness	**2**	Export diversification	**3**	Transport infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Netherlands	3.6	89	Asian Development Bank	11.7	39
Japan	0.2	4	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	7.6	26
International Development Assoc.	0.1	2	International Development Assoc.	4.0	13
Denmark	0.1	1	United Arab Emirates	2.4	8
Finland	0.1	1	Japan	2.0	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	20.2	13.0
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	22	14.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	3.7	9.4
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	35.1	47.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	5.8	94.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.9	8.4
Internet users	11.0	63.2


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (24), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (15)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	115	139
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	71	90
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	22	36
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	2	2
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	34	38

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.225	0.318	**+41%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.549	2.964	**+440%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.815	2.226	**+173%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.226	1.279	**+465%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	15	17
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	673	774
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.254	0.274
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.034	0.021
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	25	34
Number of import markets (max. 237)	58	91
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.105	0.245
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.112	0.087

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Thailand	26	Thailand	49
Japan	15	Germany	7
Sri Lanka	13	United States	7
United Kingdom	10	France	7
Other Asia, nes	5	United Kingdom	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Singapore	24	United Arab Emirates	19
United Arab Emirates	21	Singapore	13
India	9	India	12
Malaysia	7	China	12
Sri Lanka	6	Malaysia	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	77	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	82
Fish etc. prepared, preserved, n.e.s.	11	Fish etc. prepared, preserved, n.e.s.	12
Fish, dried, salted, smoked	9	Fish, dried, salted, smoked	3
Animal feed stuff	1	Animal feed stuff	1
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	1	Ferrous waste and scrap	1

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	17	Petroleum products	13
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4	Stone, sand and gravel	4
Wood, simply worked	3	Iron, steel bar, shapes, etc.	3
Furniture, cushions, etc.	3	Aircraft, associated equipment	3
Internal combustion piston engine	2	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.0	5.8
Female labour force participation rate (%)	41.1	41.8
ODA (% of gross national income)	2.2	1.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	71.0	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	5.7	3.5
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.64	0.7

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961336

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Mali

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	112.2	258.5	265.6	137%
Remittances	328.9	836.5	1039.9	216%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	28.2	91.6	683676224%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	7.1	58.6	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1590.1	1283.4	1426.5	-10%
of which Aid for Trade	237.3	268.8	296.7	25%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade facilitation	2	Export diversification	3	Connecting to value chains

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	79.8	34	International Development Assoc.	75.4	25
EU Institutions	76.0	32	African Development Fund	48.8	16
France	15.8	7	France	38.2	13
African Development Fund	13.8	6	EU Institutions	30.5	10
Germany	11.3	5	Canada	25.6	9

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.0	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	17.1	0.1
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	51.3	99.1
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.4	30.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.2
Internet users	0.7	12.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (51), intra-regional (20), extra-regional (31)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	58	54
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	16	13
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	31	27
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	97	91
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	40	41

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.550	2.896	**+87%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.291	0.441	**+51%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.473	3.600	**+144%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.674	1.323	**+96%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	200	288
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	733	855
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.577	0.445
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.063	0.062
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	71	73
Number of import markets (max. 237)	100	128
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.516	0.217
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.064	0.083

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
South Africa	71	South Africa	41
China	6	Switzerland	21
Senegal	3	Burkina Faso	6
Viet Nam	2	Bangladesh	6
Thailand	2	Cote d'Ivoire	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	15	Senegal	21
Senegal	12	China	15
Cote d'Ivoire	11	Cote d'Ivoire	10
Benin	9	France	8
China	6	Germany	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	74	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	66
Cotton	17	Live animals	10
Live animals	3	Cotton	7
Other cereals, unmilled	1	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	5
Petroleum products	1	Aircraft, associated equipment	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	23	Petroleum products	23
Lime, cement, construction materials	5	Medicaments	5
Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	5	Lime, cement, construction materials	5
Medicaments	3	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	4
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	10.8	9.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	60.6	61.4
ODA (% of gross national income)	13.1	9.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	12.4	11.4
Total debt service (% of total exports)	4.4	4.5
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.37	0.4


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961355

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Mauritania

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	212.2	424.8	329.6	55%
Remittances	...	...	77.2	-
Other official flows (OOF)	19.9	80.7	39.4	98%
of which trade-related OOF	10.3	16.2	13.9	35%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	655.2	357.7	386.2	-41%
of which Aid for Trade	79.9	112.8	125.3	57%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Regional integration	2	Transport infrastructure	3	Connecting to value chains

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	32.2	40	Arab Fund (AFESD)	71.5	57
International Development Assoc.	18.8	24	Kuwait	13.3	11
Spain	6.8	8	International Development Assoc.	12.0	10
Arab Fund (AFESD)	6.4	8	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	8.7	7
African Development Fund	5.8	7	France	4.3	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-15)	10.7	12.0
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-14)	. . .	8.1
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.3	0.5
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	89.4	94.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.5	30.3
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.3
Internet users	1.0	20.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (25), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (16)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	99	92
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	5	7
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	25	25
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2007-2017)	57	66
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	43	25

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.367	1.722	**+26%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.076	0.133	**+74%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.167	2.094	**+79%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.387	0.698	**+80%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	40
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	638
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.168
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.123
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	28	65
Number of import markets (max. 237)	78	111
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.107	0.163
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.070	0.061

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Cote d'Ivoire	14	China	35
France	11	Switzerland	15
Germany	7	Spain	12
Italy	7	Japan	7
Belgium	5	Italy	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	15	Korea, Republic of	18
Brazil	6	United Arab Emirates	9
China	6	Norway	8
United States	6	Belgium	7
Belgium	5	Netherlands	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Iron ore, concentrates	41	Iron ore, concentrates	31
Petroleum oils, crude	25	Crustaceans, molluscs etc	20
Copper ores, concentrates	13	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	16
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	12	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	14
Special transactions not classified	5	Copper ores, concentrates	10

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	25	Ship, boat, floating structures	35
Sugars, molasses, honey	6	Petroleum products	17
Civil engineering equipment	6	Civil engineering equipment	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	Wheat, meslin, unmilled	3
Wheat, meslin, unmilled	4	Other machinery, parts, specialized industries	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	10.6	10.3
Female labour force participation rate (%)	28.6	29.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	7.3	5.7
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	5.9	13.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.48	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961374

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Mauritius

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	275.8	325.4	292.7	6%
Remittances	0.7	248.2	250.2	36236%
Other official flows (OOF)	44.6	108.7	55.8	25%
of which trade-related OOF	9.1	57.9	55.8	516%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	103.2	107.3	55.3	-46%
of which Aid for Trade	6.6	59.7	26.0	291%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Regional integration	**3**	Services development

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	6.5	98	France	20.8	80
Greece	0.3	4	EU Institutions	3.1	12
Japan	0.2	4	Japan	2.0	8
Germany	0.1	1	Canada	0.1	0
UNDP	0.1	1	Australia	0.0	0

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	3.5	0.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	2	1.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.6	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	95.3	99.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	14.2	59.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	2.3	19.4
Internet users	16.7	55.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (71), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (54)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	124	95
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	42	56
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	28	31
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	29	24
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	35	34

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	2.329	2.361	**+1%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.663	3.017	**+81%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	3.409	4.995	**+47%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.312	2.200	**+68%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	594	581
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	991	996
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.078	0.052
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.036	0.026
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	126	115
Number of import markets (max. 237)	130	145
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.154	0.070
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.059	0.072

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United Kingdom	30	France	16
France	14	United Kingdom	12
United Arab Emirates	11	United States	11
United States	8	South Africa	9
Madagascar	4	Italy	7

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	14	China	16
India	14	India	16
China	9	South Africa	9
South Africa	7	France	8
Germany	4	Japan	3

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	21	Fish etc. prepared, preserved, n.e.s.	14
Sugars, molasses, honey	15	Sugars, molasses, honey	12
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	11	Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	12
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	7	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	10
Special transactions not classified	7	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	15	Petroleum products	13
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	9	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	6
Aircraft, associated equipment	6	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	5	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	2
Textile yarn	4	Medicaments	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	9.0	6.8
Female labour force participation rate (%)	41.5	45.0
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.3	0.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	20.1	1.4
Total debt service (% of total exports)	31.9	19.8
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.72	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961393

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Mexico

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	27662.1	31094.9	29695.0	7%
Remittances	26488.1	26575.4	32270.5	22%
Other official flows (OOF)	1517.8	2216.1	2433.0	60%
of which trade-related OOF	549.2	868.0	982.6	79%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	283.9	777.5	930.0	228%
of which Aid for Trade	26.0	288.0	375.2	1345%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Connecting to value chains	3	International competitiveness

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	5.7	22	Germany	133.7	36
United States	5.4	21	France	113.3	30
Japan	4.5	17	EU Institutions	95.9	26
France	2.9	11	Inter-American Development Bank	5.7	2
Germany	2.4	9	Japan	4.3	1

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	14.0	6.9
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	12	4.4
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.2	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	98.6	98.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	4.1	62.8
Fixed broadband subscriptions	2.7	13.3
Internet users	19.5	63.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (101), intra-regional (0), extra-regional (101)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	56	78
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	6	6
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	8	8
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	37	38
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	61	58

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	250.319	409.775	**+64%** ▲	
	Commercial services	15.918	27.012	**+70%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	256.631	420.765	**+64%** ▲	
	Commercial services	23.616	36.775	**+56%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	1120	1137
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1222	1192
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.037	0.030
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.011	0.014
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	182	195
Number of import markets (max. 237)	200	211
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.723	0.641
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.287	0.259

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	85	United States	80
Canada	2	Canada	3
Spain	1	Germany	2
Germany	1	China	2
Colombia	1	Spain	1

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	51	United States	46
China	10	China	18
Japan	6	Japan	4
Korea, Republic of	4	Germany	4
Germany	4	Korea, Republic of	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	14	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	10
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	7	Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	7
Television receivers etc.	7	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	6
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	6
Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	5	Automatic data processing equipment	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	6	Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	6
Transistors, valves, etc.	5	Petroleum products	6
Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	5	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5
Electric switch relay circuit	4	Transistors, valves, etc.	5
Petroleum products	4	Special transactions not classified	4


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.6	3.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	42.5	43.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.0	0.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2008-2016)	3.1	1.9
Total debt service (% of total exports)	19.9	14.0
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.74	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961412

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Mongolia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	487.6	-1241.7	1494.4	206%
Remittances	185.9	258.6	273.4	47%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	387.8	328.3	4710048%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	257.8	222.9	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	201.7	347.3	840.8	317%
of which Aid for Trade	65.5	183.8	276.4	322%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Industrialization	3	Cross-border infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	25.0	38	Japan	178.3	65
Germany	10.9	17	International Development Assoc.	44.9	16
International Development Assoc.	10.4	16	Asian Development Bank	18.9	7
Korea	6.1	9	EU Institutions	8.3	3
United States	5.2	8	Korea	6.1	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	4.5	5.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	4	5.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	4.0	1.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	71.1	69.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	7.4	80.8
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	9.3
Internet users (07-17)	9.0	23.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (44), intra-regional (11), extra-regional (33)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	113	116
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	24	14
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	23	33
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	88	55
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	34	31

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.544	5.834	**+278%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.483	0.964	**+100%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.408	4.345	**+209%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.410	2.154	**+426%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	242	279
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	770	875
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.209	0.216
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.088	0.043
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	55	59
Number of import markets (max. 237)	72	105
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.471	0.735
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.211	0.191

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
China	68	China	85
Canada	11	United Kingdom	11
United States	8	Russian Federation	1
Russian Federation	3	Italy	1
Italy	3	Other Asia, nes	0

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Russian Federation	37	China	33
China	27	Russian Federation	28
Japan	7	Japan	8
Korea, Republic of	6	United States	5
Kazakhstan	3	Korea, Republic of	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Copper ores, concentrates	41	Coal, not agglomerated	36
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	18	Copper ores, concentrates	26
Wool, other animal hair	10	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	10
Ore, concentrate base metals	9	Petroleum oils, crude	6
Coal, not agglomerated	3	Iron ore, concentrates	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	28	Petroleum products	18
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6
Printed matter	4	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	5
Civil engineering equipment	3	Civil engineering equipment	3
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	2	Electric current	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	7.0	6.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	53.6	53.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	5.4	7.7
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	5.6	12.1
Total debt service (% of total exports)	2.5	56.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.66	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961431

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Myanmar

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	443.3	2253.1	4341.0	879%
Remittances	83.6	2071.7	2565.4	2967%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.9	395.2	220.3	24957%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	48.9	199.5	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	286.3	1653.0	1589.8	455%
of which Aid for Trade	16.1	321.7	529.0	3190%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade finance access	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Trade policy

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	8.0	49	Japan	236.7	45
Korea	1.8	11	International Development Assoc.	78.8	15
UNDP	1.5	10	Korea	53.9	10
Australia	1.4	9	United Kingdom	47.3	9
Italy	1.2	8	Asian Development Bank	23.4	4

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	5.6	6.5
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	4.9
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	4.1	0.6
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	16.7	97.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	89.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.2
Internet users	0.2	30.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (0), intra-regional (0), extra-regional (0)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	49	49
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	6	29
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	21	15
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	...	27
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s)	...	40

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	4.222	9.832	**+133%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.291	4.066	**+1299%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	2.070	15.784	**+663%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.541	2.870	**+430%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	...	512
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	...	1054
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.076
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.039
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	...	125
Number of import markets (max. 237)	...	157
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.196
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.148

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		China	39
		Thailand	19
...		Japan	7
		Singapore	5
		India	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		China	32
		Singapore	15
...		Thailand	11
		Japan	5
		Malaysia	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		Natural gas	24
		Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	8
...		Rice	7
		Veg.	7
		Sugars, molasses, honey	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		Petroleum products	18
		Sugars, molasses, honey	4
...		Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	4
		Fabrics, man-made fibres	4
		Animal, veg. fats, oils, n.e.s.	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.0	1.6
Female labour force participation rate (%)	55.7	47.9
ODA (% of gross national income)	1.0	2.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2005-2017)	3.9	9.0
Total debt service (% of total exports)	1.2	5.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.49	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961450

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Nepal

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	0.1	62.6	198.0	234832%
Remittances	1971.4	6410.2	6928.1	251%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.4	0.2	0.1	-70%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	593.2	1214.4	1436.6	142%
of which Aid for Trade	127.7	334.8	488.6	283%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Transport infrastructure	**2**	Connecting to value chains	**3**	International competitiveness

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	33.5	26	International Development Assoc.	195.1	40
United Kingdom	24.6	19	Asian Development Bank	128.5	26
Germany	21.4	17	United States	41.2	8
Japan	16.4	13	United Kingdom	31.7	6
Norway	10.4	8	Denmark	13.2	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-16)	13.9	12.1
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	13.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	11.8	0.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	37.8	97.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.1	52.4
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	1.7
Internet users	1.1	21.4


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (54), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (37)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	45	56
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	23	62
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	17	14
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	...	49
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s)	...	50

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.849	0.840		**-1%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.252	1.383	**+449%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	2.441	10.000	**+310%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.488	1.591	**+226%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	...	302
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	...	1040
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.035
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.021
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	...	85
Number of import markets (max. 237)	...	120
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.336
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.456

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		India	57
		United States	11
...		Turkey	6
		Germany	4
		United Kingdom	3

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		India	65
		China	13
...		United Arab Emirates	2
		France	2
		Argentina	1

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		Textile yarn	11
		Floor coverings, etc.	9
...		Spices	7
		Fruit, veg. juices	6
		Fabrics, man-made fibres	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		Petroleum products	11
		Ingots etc. iron or steel	5
...		Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3
		Lime, cement, construction materials	3
		Civil engineering equipment	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.6	1.3
Female labour force participation rate (%)	79.6	81.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	5.0	5.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	25.4	17.8
Total debt service (% of total exports)	10.2	8.5
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.49	0.6

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961469

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Niger

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	173.3	550.7	334.3	93%
Remittances	83.7	188.9	197.8	136%
Other official flows (OOF)	2.6	16.5	18.5	604%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	9.7	7.7	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	999.8	948.3	1257.9	26%
of which Aid for Trade	92.0	155.6	283.2	208%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade finance access	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Export diversification

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	48.8	53	International Development Assoc.	135.9	48
International Development Assoc.	17.5	19	EU Institutions	67.8	24
African Development Fund	6.6	7	France	14.7	5
France	5.0	5	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	11.0	4
Japan	3.3	4	United States	10.4	4

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.0	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	10.9
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.0	0.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	99.6	100.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	4.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.0
Internet users	0.3	10.2


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (44), intra-regional (15), extra-regional (29)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	46	53
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	14	14
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	30	33
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	69	69
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	39	50

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.508	1.206	**+137%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.084	0.204	**+144%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.748	1.952	**+161%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.327	0.971	**+197%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	198	193
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	603	656
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.136	0.171
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.031	0.054
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	54	68
Number of import markets (max. 237)	99	109
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.170	0.132
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.061	0.118


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
France	24	France	31
Nigeria	10	Thailand	12
Japan	9	Malaysia	11
Switzerland	8	Nigeria	9
Ghana	3	Mali	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
France	15	France	28
China	12	China	16
United States	10	United States	8
Cote d'Ivoire	6	Nigeria	6
Nigeria	6	Thailand	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Uranium, thorium ores, etc.	32	Uranium, thorium ores, etc.	32
Live animals	16	Petroleum products	16
Veg.	11	Rice	14
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	8	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	14
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Petroleum products	12	Aircraft, associated equipment	20
Rice	7	Rice	8
Lime, cement, construction materials	4	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	4
Worn clothing, textile articles	4	Lime, cement, construction materials	4
Civil engineering equipment	4	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	4


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.2	0.3
Female labour force participation rate (%)	68.1	67.4
ODA (% of gross national income)	14.9	15.2
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	26.6	15.6
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.29	0.4


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961488

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Nigeria

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	6411.1	4068.9	3503.0	-45%
Remittances	18050.0	20547.7	22000.7	22%
Other official flows (OOF)	163.3	529.6	1449.1	787%
of which trade-related OOF	28.1	515.4	692.5	2361%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	5283.6	2597.8	3471.6	-34%
of which Aid for Trade	244.6	535.5	695.4	184%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	E-commerce	2	Transport infrastructure	3	Services development

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	126.0	52	International Development Assoc.	375.7	54
United Kingdom	81.6	33	Germany	127.9	18
United States	8.4	3	France	43.5	6
Japan	7.5	3	United Kingdom	42.8	6
African Development Fund	6.0	2	EU Institutions	38.8	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-16)	12.0	12.1
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	8.8
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.0	0.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	97.5	94.8
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.6	19.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.0	0.1
Internet users	5.5	27.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (55), intra-regional (20), extra-regional (35)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	39	27
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	3	9
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	36	36
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	1	3
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	53	44

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	56.934	45.742		**-20%** ▼
	Commercial services	2.057	4.541	**+121%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	21.988	32.616	**+48%** ▲	
	Commercial services	12.115	17.973	**+48%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

PRODUCT DIVERSIFICATION (BASED ON HS02, 4-DIG.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	154	222
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	964	1094
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.862	0.675
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.014	0.080
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	67	110
Number of import markets (max. 237)	194	156
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.218	0.072
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.071	0.072
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.067	0.053


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	45	India	18
India	9	United States	13
Spain	8	Spain	10
France	6	Netherlands	8
Brazil	4	France	8

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	16	China	19
China	14	Belgium	13
United Kingdom	12	Netherlands	9
Germany	6	United States	8
Belgium	5	India	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	93	Petroleum oils, crude	81
Petroleum products	5	Natural gas	12
Ship, boat, floating structures	1	Petroleum gases, n.e.s.	1
Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	0	Liquefied propane, butane	1
Leather	0	Ship, boat, floating structures	1

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Wheat, meslin, unmilled	6	Petroleum products	27
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5	Wheat, meslin, unmilled	4
Arms and ammunition	4	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	2
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	2
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	3	Stone, sand and gravel	2

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.7	6.0
Female labour force participation rate (%)	48.0	50.5
ODA (% of gross national income)	8.1	0.9
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	11.0	6.8
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.48	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961507

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Pakistan

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	5100.3	1989.3	2806.0	-45%
Remittances	6052.7	18786.0	19689.0	225%
Other official flows (OOF)	163.7	870.2	1420.5	768%
of which trade-related OOF	138.2	562.9	1158.7	738%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1908.2	4108.1	3368.1	77%
of which Aid for Trade	338.9	1559.9	928.3	174%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Network infrastructure	2	Transport infrastructure	3	Export diversification

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	190.0	56	International Development Assoc.	435.0	47
United States	47.1	14	United Kingdom	153.3	17
Japan	37.3	11	United States	115.5	12
Germany	29.6	9	Japan	75.8	8
United Kingdom	12.5	4	Asian Development Bank	67.0	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-16)	14.3	12.1
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	13	11.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	7.6	5.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	19.0	60.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.1	24.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.9
Internet users	6.5	15.5


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (103), intra-regional (14), extra-regional (89)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	39	30
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	11	14
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	24	16
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	35	32
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	42	49

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	17.065	23.203	**+36%** ▲	
	Commercial services	2.214	3.914	**+77%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	26.597	53.258	**+100%** ▲	
	Commercial services	8.177	9.858	**+21%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	827	818
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1092	1107
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.050	0.045
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.039	0.026
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	196	186
Number of import markets (max. 237)	186	184
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.084	0.050
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.050	0.103


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	26	United States	16
United Arab Emirates	7	United Kingdom	7
Afghanistan	6	China	7
United Kingdom	6	Afghanistan	6
Germany	4	Germany	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United Arab Emirates	11	China	27
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	10	United Arab Emirates	13
China	10	United States	5
United States	6	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	5
Kuwait	6	Indonesia	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Textile articles, n.e.s.	19	Textile articles, n.e.s.	18
Cotton fabrics, woven	12	Cotton fabrics, woven	10
Textile yarn	9	Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	9
Rice	7	Rice	8
Mens, boys clothing, knit	5	Textile yarn	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	13	Petroleum products	13
Petroleum products	12	Petroleum oils, crude	5
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	7	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	4
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Natural gas	3
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	3	Ferrous waste and scrap	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	0.6	3.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	18.9	23.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	1.5	0.7
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2005-2017)	18.8	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	10.8	22.8
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.51	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961545

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Palau

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	15.0	35.5	35.5	137%
Remittances	1.6	2.3	2.4	56%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	2.9	10.6	27091%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	2.2	6.2	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	33.6	18.4	22.1	-34%
of which Aid for Trade	7.8	4.6	9.4	20%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	-	**2**	-	**3**	-

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	7.2	92	Japan	5.0	53
EU Institutions	0.5	7	Asian Development Bank	3.1	33
United States	0.1	1	Australia	0.8	9
Korea	0.0	0	United Arab Emirates	0.5	5
Australia	0.0	0			

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-17)	2.9	3.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	5.8
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	3.5	2.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	2.6	35.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	...
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.5	...
Internet users	. . .	...


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (4), intra-regional (2), extra-regional (2)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	. . .	...
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	...	...
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	...	15
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2007-2017)	23	26

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	...	...		
	Commercial services	...	...		
Imports	Goods	...	...		
	Commercial services	...	...		

Sources: WTO Secretariat

PRODUCT DIVERSIFICATION (BASED ON HS02, 4-DIG.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	38
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	549	564
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.116
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.090	0.040
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	9
Number of import markets (max. 237)	33	46
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.178
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.183	0.192
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.067	0.053


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		Japan	23
		Guam	15
...		United States	8
		Australia	8
		Other Asia, nes	3

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
United States	31	United States	36
Singapore	25	Singapore	15
Guam	11	Japan	13
Japan	9	Korea, Republic of	7
Philippines	6	China	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
		Civil engineering equipment	21
		Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	20
...		Measure, control instrument	18
		Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	13
		Mach-tools,metal-working	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	29	Petroleum products	19
Alcoholic beverages	3	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	2	Alcoholic beverages	3
Non-alcohol beverages, n.e.s.	2	Measure, control instrument	2
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	2	Cereal preparations	2

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	. . .	. . .
Female labour force participation rate (%)	. . .	. . .
ODA (% of gross national income)	20.8	7.9
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2008-2016)	24.1	24.7
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.76	0.8

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961564

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Panama

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	2197.5	4726.1	5319.2	142%
Remittances	344.6	604.3	533.2	55%
Other official flows (OOF)	70.2	979.3	908.1	1193%
of which trade-related OOF	19.1	580.9	677.5	3445%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	49.2	39.7	65.5	33%
of which Aid for Trade	7.7	6.2	12.6	63%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Services development	2	Trade facilitation	3	Network infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	3.4	44	Japan	3.7	30
Spain	2.5	33	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	2.8	22
Korea	0.8	10	Adaptation Fund	2.2	18
United States	0.6	8	United States	1.7	14
Germany	0.1	2	Inter-American Development Bank	1.2	10

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	7.3	6.9
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	6.4
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	16.7	4.9
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	64.1	67.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	3.2	60.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	3.3	10.9
Internet users	17.3	57.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (56), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (39)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	134	87
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	32	49
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	14	17
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	15	35
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	23	35

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	8.465	13.822	**+63%** ▲	
	Commercial services	3.936	13.303	**+238%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	10.189	22.293	**+119%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.641	4.652	**+183%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	769	893
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1025	845
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.025	0.037
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.017	0.043
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	100	103
Number of import markets (max. 237)	95	85
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.080	0.082
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.102	0.147


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	20	United States	21
Colombia	16	Colombia	10
United States	9	Costa Rica	7
Guatemala	6	Venezuela, Bolivarian Rep. of	5
Dominican Republic	5	Dominican Republic	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
China	20	China	31
United States	19	Singapore	19
Hong Kong, China	12	United States	10
Other Asia, nes	7	Mexico	5
Neth. Antilles	5	Viet Nam	3

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Medicaments	10	Medicaments	14
Footwear	9	Organo-inorganic compounds	8
Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	7	Footwear	8
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	5	Nitrogen-funct.compounds	7
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	5	Perfumery, cosmetics, etc.	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Footwear	7	Medicaments	14
Medicaments	6	Organo-inorganic compounds	11
Petroleum products	6	Nitrogen-funct.compounds	8
Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	5	Footwear	8
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.9	3.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	46.6	52.5
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.2	0.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.74	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961583

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Papua New Guinea

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	19.5	-13.9	-200.5	-
Remittances	6.5	7.9	4.2	-35%
Other official flows (OOF)	15.8	113.1	103.5	556%
of which trade-related OOF	10.1	77.9	84.1	732%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	353.0	608.1	574.7	63%
of which Aid for Trade	87.7	175.4	155.4	77%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Transport infrastructure	**2**	Cross-border infrastructure	**3**	Export diversification

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Australia	67.5	77	Australia	80.0	51
EU Institutions	12.3	14	Asian Development Bank	33.2	21
Japan	4.7	5	International Development Assoc.	20.2	13
New Zealand	1.6	2	New Zealand	10.1	7
International Development Assoc.	0.7	1	Japan	9.1	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-14)	5.5	4.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.2	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	92.5	95.9
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	11.1
Fixed broadband subscriptions (08-17)	0.0	0.2
Internet users	1.8	11.2


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (40), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (23)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	97	72
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	7	2
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	44	34
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	4.204	9.956	**+137%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.305	0.254	**-16%**	**-16%** ▼
Imports	Goods	1.991	2.977	**+50%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.584	1.510	**-5%**	**-5%** ▼

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.1	2.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	57.2	46.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	3.7	2.6
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	2.8
Total debt service (% of total exports)	7.1	27.1
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.48	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961602

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Paraguay

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	186.7	346.0	355.8	91%
Remittances	346.5	572.4	704.1	103%
Other official flows (OOF)	33.4	258.1	339.8	917%
of which trade-related OOF	20.9	192.9	186.4	792%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	150.5	142.0	204.2	36%
of which Aid for Trade	35.0	59.7	108.3	210%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Services development	3	Cross-border infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	23.4	67	Inter-American Development Bank	31.1	29
EU Institutions	3.7	11	EU Institutions	31.0	29
Korea	2.0	6	Japan	16.0	15
Spain	1.7	5	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	14.9	14
Germany	1.3	4	Spain	7.4	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	9.9	9.8
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	6.6
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.4	1.9
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	93.2	92.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	2.8	47.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	4.1
Internet users	8.0	61.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (60), intra-regional (14), extra-regional (46)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	85	67
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	4	7
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	7	9
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	37	55
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	35	36

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	5.950	12.990	**+118%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.277	0.938	**+239%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	4.853	11.288	**+133%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.365	1.175	**+222%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat

Note: For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	342	437
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	900	998
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.246	0.139
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.044	0.024
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	101	125
Number of import markets (max. 237)	79	104
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.255	0.130
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.145	0.163

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat

Note: Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Brazil	48	Brazil	32
Argentina	13	Argentina	13
Uruguay	10	Chile	7
Russian Federation	6	Russian Federation	7
Cayman Islands	5	Turkey	3

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
China	27	China	31
Brazil	21	Brazil	23
Argentina	15	Argentina	10
United States	7	United States	8
Japan	4	Netherlands	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Electric current	47	Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	25
Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	13	Electric current	24
Bovine meat	12	Bovine meat	13
Maize unmilled	5	Animal feed stuff	9
Animal feed stuff	4	Fixed veg. fat, oils, soft	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	15	Petroleum products	11
Automatic data processing equipment	11	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	7
Parts, for office machines	7	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	4
Sound recorder, phonograph	4	Automatic data processing equipment	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	5.3	4.6
Female labour force participation rate (%)	52.3	56.6
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.7	0.5
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	14.5	10.1
Total debt service (% of total exports)	6.8	12.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.65	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961621

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Peru

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	5293.7	6525.2	6769.5	28%
Remittances	2137.3	2748.5	3051.2	43%
Other official flows (OOF)	316.5	850.6	296.1	-6%
of which trade-related OOF	160.3	387.1	187.4	17%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	684.9	506.4	577.4	-16%
of which Aid for Trade	179.9	105.4	253.6	41%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	International competitiveness	2	Connecting to value chains	3	Export diversification

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Norway	45.3	25	EU Institutions	95.7	38
United States	44.4	25	Germany	91.4	36
EU Institutions	27.4	15	United States	16.6	7
Spain	21.4	12	Japan	10.5	4
Japan	9.8	5	Canada	8.4	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	10.2	2.4
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	1.9
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.6	0.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	84.0	98.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.9	64.2
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.7	7.2
Internet users	20.7	48.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (76), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (60)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	50	47
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	10	14
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	18	18
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	79	76
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	46	44

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	23.830	44.918	**+88%** ▲	
	Commercial services	2.533	7.232	**+186%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	14.468	38.261	**+164%** ▲	
	Commercial services	3.277	8.657	**+164%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	845	923
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1086	1113
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.074	0.110
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.027	0.016
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	157	164
Number of import markets (max. 237)	128	150
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.089	0.107
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.065	0.102


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	24	China	26
China	10	United States	16
Switzerland	7	Switzerland	5
Canada	7	Korea, Republic of	5
Chile	6	India	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	16	China	22
Brazil	10	United States	20
China	10	Brazil	6
Ecuador	7	Mexico	4
Colombia	6	Ecuador	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	17	Copper ores, concentrates	27
Copper	15	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	16
Ore, concentrate base metals	13	Ore, concentrate base metals	8
Copper ores, concentrates	12	Petroleum products	6
Petroleum products	6	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	14	Petroleum products	8
Petroleum products	4	Petroleum oils, crude	6
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	2	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4
Civil engineering equipment	2	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	4.3	3.5
Female labour force participation rate (%)	67.1	69.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.6	0.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	5.2	1.6
Total debt service (% of total exports)	13.1	21.7
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.70	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961640

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Philippines

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	2432.2	5548.8	9524.3	292%
Remittances	16928.1	29877.4	32809.8	94%
Other official flows (OOF)	392.7	1818.6	1188.6	203%
of which trade-related OOF	141.3	827.8	183.7	30%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1096.6	1237.9	823.7	-25%
of which Aid for Trade	468.9	318.1	274.8	-41%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Other (MSMEs, women, youth, etc.)	2	Export diversification	3	International competitiveness

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	349.8	75	Japan	212.5	77
Germany	25.8	6	Korea	23.7	9
Norway	22.9	5	United States	12.0	4
United States	20.3	4	Australia	8.1	3
Korea	17.7	4	Germany	7.3	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	6.3	6.3
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	4	6.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.6	0.9
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	86.4	93.3
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	2.3	68.6
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.3	3.2
Internet users	5.7	60.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (98), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (81)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	74	66
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	26	41
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	13	22
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	68	68
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	70	57

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	30.734	51.865	**+69%** ▲	
	Commercial services	11.064	35.865	**+224%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	42.194	92.370	**+119%** ▲	
	Commercial services	6.491	26.342	**+306%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2007-2017)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	849	902
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1157	1163
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.130	0.066
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.112	0.026
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	174	191
Number of import markets (max. 237)	129	167
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.103	0.091
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.079	0.081


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	18	Japan	16
Japan	17	United States	14
Netherlands	10	Hong Kong, China	13
China	10	China	12
Hong Kong, China	8	Korea, Republic of	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	16	China	18
Japan	14	Japan	12
Singapore	8	Korea, Republic of	9
Other Asia, nes	8	United States	8
China	7	Thailand	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Transistors, valves, etc.	36	Transistors, valves, etc.	23
Automatic data processing equipment	10	Electric machine apparatus, n.e.s.	13
Parts, for office machines	7	Automatic data processing equipment	8
Electric machine apparatus, n.e.s.	3	Electric distribution equipment, n.e.s.	3
Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	3	Copper	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Transistors, valves, etc.	33	Transistors, valves, etc.	13
Petroleum oils, crude	10	Petroleum products	6
Parts, for office machines	7	Parts, for office machines	4
Petroleum products	4	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	2	Petroleum oils, crude	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	4.1	2.6
Female labour force participation rate (%)	48.0	45.5
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.4	0.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	23.0	20.4
Total debt service (% of total exports)	27.6	11.3
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.65	0.7

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961659

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Saint Kitts and Nevis

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	140.9	126.7	126.7	-10%
Remittances	36.4	20.6	21.8	-40%
Other official flows (OOF)	2.1	. . .	. . .	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	. . .	. . .	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	17.6	. . .	. . .	-
of which Aid for Trade	0.0	. . .	. . .	-


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Services development	**2**	Trade finance access	**3**	Trade facilitation

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	1.6				
EU Institutions	0.1				
			...		

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	9.2	9.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.2	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	98.6	98.7
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	84.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	17.9	28.9
Internet users	38.5	80.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (11), intra-regional (5), extra-regional (6)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	83	101
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	75	95
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	31	42
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	76	57
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	41	37

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.058	0.025		**-57%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.172	0.444	**+158%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.220	0.310	**+41%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.096	0.223	**+131%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	...	87
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	...	635
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.108
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	...	0.008
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	17	25
Number of import markets (max. 237)	69	88
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.774	0.486
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.354	0.456

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	89	United States	69
United Kingdom	2	Saint Lucia	7
Trinidad and Tobago	2	Trinidad and Tobago	7
Neth. Antilles	1	Antigua and Barbuda	3
Saint Lucia	1	Dominica	2

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	58	United States	67
Trinidad and Tobago	12	Trinidad and Tobago	4
United Kingdom	5	Canada	3
Japan	4	Japan	3
Canada	3	China	3

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Electric switch relay circuit	45	Electric switch relay circuit	27
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	26	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	26
Rotating electric plant	10	Printed matter	12
Alcoholic beverages	3	Gold, silverware, jewel, n.e.s.	6
Non-alcohol beverages, n.e.s.	3	Alcoholic beverages	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	7	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	Gold, silverware, jewel, n.e.s.	5
Electric switch relay circuit	3	Furniture, cushions, etc.	4
Furniture, cushions, etc.	3	Other meat, meat offal	3
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	...	...
Female labour force participation rate (%)	...	...
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.9	...
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	9.7	...
Total debt service (% of total exports)	...	...
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.73	0.8

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961678

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	129.3	87.1	87.1	-33%
Remittances	27.1	43.2	45.3	67%
Other official flows (OOF)	2.3	2.6	0.0	-100%
of which trade-related OOF	0.8	0.0	0.0	-100%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	31.3	16.8	15.1	-52%
of which Aid for Trade	9.6	3.6	4.1	-57%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade finance access	2	Regional integration	3	Transport infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	5.2	54	EU Institutions	2.3	57
Japan	4.0	42	United Arab Emirates	0.8	18
International Development Assoc.	0.2	2	International Development Assoc.	0.5	12
Germany	0.1	1	Japan	0.3	8
Austria	0.1	1	Kuwait	0.1	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	9.8	10.0
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	13.1
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	2.4	1.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	95.3	87.9
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	52.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	5.2	22.0
Internet users	12.0	65.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (12), intra-regional (5), extra-regional (7)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	86	90
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	80	87
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	25	32
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	33	58
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	37	37

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.041	0.037		**-10%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.169	0.245	**+45%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.238	0.290	**+22%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.080	0.134	**+67%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	96
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	601
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.095
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.013
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	25	23
Number of import markets (max. 237)	74	86
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.101	0.082
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.178	0.174

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United Kingdom	25	Barbados	19
Trinidad and Tobago	15	Saint Lucia	16
Barbados	14	Dominica	14
Saint Lucia	12	Antigua and Barbuda	13
Antigua and Barbuda	8	Trinidad and Tobago	12

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	33	United States	38
Trinidad and Tobago	26	Trinidad and Tobago	16
United Kingdom	7	United Kingdom	7
Japan	4	China	6
Canada	4	Italy	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	31	Meal, flour of wheat, meslin	25
Meal, flour of wheat, meslin	13	Flat-rolled plated iron	10
Veg.	11	Alcoholic beverages	9
Rice	10	Veg.	8
Animal feed stuff	5	Animal feed stuff	8

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	13	Petroleum products	8
Lime, cement, construction materials	3	Other meat, meat offal	4
Other meat, meat offal	3	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	3
Metallic structures, n.e.s.	3	Lime, cement, construction materials	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	19.3	19.7
Female labour force participation rate (%)	55.2	57.2
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.8	0.9
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	35.4	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	14.8	11.6
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.70	0.7

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961697

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Samoa

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	26.1	17.4	9.0	-66%
Remittances	97.6	134.1	137.8	41%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.5	0.7	3.9	629%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.1	2.7	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	42.8	100.9	142.0	232%
of which Aid for Trade	8.4	34.0	75.3	797%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	International competitiveness	**2**	Services development	**3**	Network infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	3.5	42	Japan	24.1	32
International Development Assoc.	2.6	31	International Development Assoc.	17.2	23
Australia	1.8	22	Australia	14.9	20
New Zealand	0.4	4	Asian Development Bank	11.6	15
UNDP	0.0	0	New Zealand	5.7	8

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	. . .	11.4
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	9.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (06-16)	. . .	1.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (06-16)	. . .	91.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	26.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	0.9
Internet users	4.5	33.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (11), intra-regional (7), extra-regional (4)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	84	82
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	93	87
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	22	21
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	76	17
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	27	35

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.010	0.038	**+264%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.138	0.243	**+76%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.219	0.324	**+48%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.062	0.087	**+40%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	94
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	611
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.175
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.030
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	13	21
Number of import markets (max. 237)	33	45
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.506	0.148
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.146	0.118

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Australia	72	American Samoa	27
American Samoa	15	Australia	21
United States	4	New Zealand	20
New Zealand	4	Tokelau	8
Tokelau	3	United States	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
New Zealand	33	New Zealand	26
Australia	16	Singapore	17
United States	12	United States	11
Japan	10	Australia	10
Singapore	9	China	9

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Electric distribution equipment, n.e.s.	73	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	30
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	12	Petroleum products	29
Fruit, veg. juices	3	Veg.	10
Alcoholic beverages	3	Electric distribution equipment, n.e.s.	8
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	2	Alcoholic beverages	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	21	Petroleum products	15
Petroleum products	15	Other meat, meat offal	7
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	6	Cereal preparations	3
Wire products excluding electrical wiring	5	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3
Other meat, meat offal	4	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	5.0	8.3
Female labour force participation rate (%)	24.5	23.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	10.2	15.6
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	10.6
Total debt service (% of total exports)	4.6	8.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.68	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961716

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for São Tomé and Príncipe

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	51.0	25.9	41.0	-20%
Remittances	2.2	21.6	18.2	727%
Other official flows (OOF)	44.7	0.0	0.0	-100%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.0	0.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	88.5	48.5	45.2	-49%
of which Aid for Trade	6.6	11.4	7.7	15%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade facilitation	**2**	Export diversification	**3**	Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	3.0	46	African Development Fund	2.7	36
Portugal	1.4	21	EU Institutions	1.8	23
International Development Assoc.	0.7	10	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	1.4	19
Belgium	0.5	7	International Development Assoc.	0.6	7
Spain	0.3	5	Portugal	0.5	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-16)	...	10.0
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	...	9.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (06-16)	...	0.6
Exports: duty free (value in %) (06-16)	...	95.4
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	34.3
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	0.7
Internet users	14.2	29.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (4), intra-regional (0), extra-regional (4)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	68	70
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	51	82
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	21	32
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	93	89
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	31	29

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.008	0.016	**+102%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.008	0.072	**+780%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.059	0.128	**+116%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.016	0.059	**+277%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	23
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	430
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.635
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.045
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	10	19
Number of import markets (max. 237)	31	48
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.173	0.123
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.455	0.328

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Portugal	33	Netherlands	30
Netherlands	27	Spain	17
Belgium	14	France	16
France	9	Belgium	14
Bahamas	3	Germany	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Portugal	65	Portugal	54
Angola	20	Angola	20
Belgium	4	China	5
Viet Nam	1	Nigeria	2
Netherlands	1	United States	2

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Cocoa	88	Cocoa	79
Alcoholic beverages	3	Aircraft, associated equipment	3
Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	3	Printed matter	3
Chocolate, other cocoa preparations	2	Ferrous waste and scrap	2
Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	1	Spices	2

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	20	Petroleum products	19
Alcoholic beverages	8	Rotating electric plant	4
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	Rice	4
Lime, cement, construction materials	4	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Rice	3	Alcoholic beverages	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	16.7	13.1
Female labour force participation rate (%)	40.6	43.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	17.0	10.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	22.0	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	31.7	3.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.53	0.6

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961735

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Senegal

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	305.1	427.8	532.3	74%
Remittances	1197.7	1849.0	2237.7	87%
Other official flows (OOF)	48.7	130.9	332.4	583%
of which trade-related OOF	7.2	77.9	153.0	2023%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	1716.4	1003.1	1037.6	-40%
of which Aid for Trade	219.3	397.0	376.5	72%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Connecting to value chains	**2**	Export diversification	**3**	E-commerce

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	62.6	29	International Development Assoc.	170.6	45
EU Institutions	45.3	21	France	61.9	16
France	44.9	20	United States	25.0	7
African Development Fund	10.6	5	EU Institutions	24.2	6
Germany	10.6	5	African Development Fund	17.8	5

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.0	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-15)	9	9.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	3.4	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	75.7	98.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.2	26.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.3	0.7
Internet users	5.6	29.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (71), intra-regional (29), extra-regional (42)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	53	56
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	31	26
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	20	20
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	33	50
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	34	38

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.600	3.278	**+105%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.710	1.130	**+59%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	3.193	5.973	**+87%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.808	1.464	**+81%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	541	545
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	915	964
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.075	0.053
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.044	0.028
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	113	110
Number of import markets (max. 237)	120	141
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.083	0.067
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.072	0.050

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Mali	20	Mali	20
France	8	Switzerland	10
Gambia	6	India	5
India	5	Cote d'Ivoire	5
Spain	5	United Arab Emirates	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
France	24	France	15
United Kingdom	6	China	10
China	4	Nigeria	8
Thailand	4	India	7
Spain	4	Netherlands	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	24	Petroleum products	14
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	10	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	13
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	7	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	10
Lime, cement, construction materials	5	Lime, cement, construction materials	7
Inorganic chemical elements	5	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	18	Petroleum products	11
Rice	6	Petroleum oils, crude	8
Petroleum oils, crude	4	Rice	6
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Medicaments	3
Medicaments	3	Edible products and preparations, n.e.s.	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	10.0	6.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	34.0	35.1
ODA (% of gross national income)	9.4	5.8
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	14.3
Total debt service (% of total exports)	7.2	14.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.43	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961754

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Seychelles

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	169.8	193.2	191.9	13%
Remittances	7.1	18.5	21.7	207%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	15.4	9.0	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	7.3	6.7	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	8.2	17.0	21.7	165%
of which Aid for Trade	3.1	4.2	9.8	218%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	E-commerce	2	Trade facilitation	3	Trade policy

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	1.6	51	Japan	5.3	54
Japan	1.3	42	EU Institutions	3.6	36
France	0.2	6	France	0.6	7
Austria	0.0	0	African Development Bank	0.2	2
Korea	0.0	0	Australia	0.1	1

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	...	2.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	...	3.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (06-16)	...	0.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (06-16)	...	87.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.6	76.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	2.8	16.1
Internet users	35.0	58.8


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (34), intra-regional (5), extra-regional (29)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	178	217
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	49	63
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	28	32
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	1	4
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	23	23

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.419	0.565	**+35%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.410	0.982	**+140%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.702	1.155	**+65%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.274	0.548	**+100%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	96
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	764
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.266
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.050
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	37	66
Number of import markets (max. 237)	69	113
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.249	0.176
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.099	0.093

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	42	United Arab Emirates	36
United Kingdom	24	France	18
France	15	United Kingdom	13
Italy	10	Italy	8
Germany	2	Netherlands	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	26	United Arab Emirates	26
Singapore	11	Spain	10
France	8	France	9
Spain	8	Hong Kong, China	6
South Africa	7	South Africa	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Fish etc. prepared, preserved, n.e.s.	49	Fish etc. prepared, preserved, n.e.s.	43
Petroleum products	42	Petroleum products	26
Medical instruments, n.e.s.	4	Aircraft, associated equipment	11
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	1	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	7
Animal feed stuff	1	Ship, boat, floating structures	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	26	Petroleum products	15
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	12	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	12
Special transactions not classified	7	Ship, boat, floating structures	10
Ship, boat, floating structures	3	Aircraft, associated equipment	6
Fixed veg. fat, oils, soft	2	Pumps n.e.s., centrifugs etc	5


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	. . .	. . .
Female labour force participation rate (%)	. . .	. . .
ODA (% of gross national income)	1.3	1.4
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	16.3	6.1
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.72	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961773

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Solomon Islands

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	68.4	30.2	36.5	-47%
Remittances	10.8	18.4	16.1	48%
Other official flows (OOF)	2.7	16.5	2.3	-14%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	2.2	2.1	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	221.1	195.6	194.6	-12%
of which Aid for Trade	15.4	42.8	57.2	271%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Transport infrastructure	2	Export diversification	3	Network infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	9.7	63	Australia	20.4	36
New Zealand	4.0	26	Asian Development Bank	10.9	19
Australia	1.0	6	Japan	9.1	16
EU Institutions	0.6	4	New Zealand	7.3	13
Korea	0.1	0	EU Institutions	5.7	10

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	14.5	9.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	8.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.4	0.7
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	90.5	88.3
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.6	18.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	0.2
Internet users	1.6	11.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (0), intra-regional (0), extra-regional (0)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	92	97
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	29	22
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	25	30
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	76	91
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	44	38

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.114	0.469	**+311%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.047	0.134	**+188%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.195	0.462	**+136%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.066	0.202	**+205%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	31	75
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	566	680
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.423	0.424
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.024	0.036
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	27	37
Number of import markets (max. 237)	34	58
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.232	0.435
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.154	0.103


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
China	42	China	65
Japan	10	Italy	8
Korea, Republic of	7	Switzerland	4
Thailand	6	India	4
Philippines	4	Philippines	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Australia	37	Australia	20
Singapore	11	Singapore	14
Malaysia	8	New Zealand	13
New Zealand	8	Malaysia	13
Japan	7	China	13

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Wood rough, rough squared	65	Wood rough, rough squared	64
Special transactions not classified	11	Fish, dried, salted, smoked	8
Fish, dried, salted, smoked	7	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	8
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	4	Veneers, plywood, etc.	5
Cocoa	3	Aluminium ores and concentrates	4

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	11	Petroleum products	13
Rice	9	Electric machine apparatus, n.e.s.	10
Civil engineering equipment	5	Rice	8
Printed matter	5	Civil engineering equipment	6
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Alcoholic beverages	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.1	1.8
Female labour force participation rate (%)	63.6	62.5
ODA (% of gross national income)	43.3	15.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	8.4
Total debt service (% of total exports)	2.5	3.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.50	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



ECONOMIC STRUCTURE


2006
DATA NOT AVAILABLE

2017
DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Agriculture, value added (% of GDP)
Industry, value added (% of GDP)
Services, etc., value added (% of GDP)

Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961792

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Sri Lanka

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	611.9	823.4	1374.9	125%
Remittances	2532.9	7099.3	7190.3	184%
Other official flows (OOF)	48.9	378.8	334.4	584%
of which trade-related OOF	9.7	237.3	250.4	2478%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	931.0	871.2	776.7	-17%
of which Aid for Trade	283.4	373.1	262.1	-8%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Connecting to value chains	**2**	Export diversification	**3**	Trade facilitation

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	146.4	52	Japan	163.3	62
International Development Assoc.	55.5	20	Asian Development Bank	36.6	14
Germany	22.6	8	International Development Assoc.	15.7	6
Spain	7.6	3	Kuwait	8.6	3
Korea	7.0	2	Australia	8.4	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	11.2	9.3
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	7.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	7.1	7.8
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	54.3	40.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.5	22.4
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	5.8
Internet users	2.5	34.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (86), intra-regional (15), extra-regional (71)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	71	51
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	19	40
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	28	17
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	30	24
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	54	49

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	6.883	11.360	**+65%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.604	7.726	**+382%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	8.305	20.980	**+153%** ▲	
	Commercial services	3.281	4.353	**+33%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	657	761
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1065	1087
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.039	0.032
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.020	0.017
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	169	182
Number of import markets (max. 237)	122	155
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.122	0.083
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.068	0.100

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	30	United States	25
United Kingdom	13	United Kingdom	9
India	7	India	7
Belgium	5	Germany	5
Germany	5	Italy	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
India	18	India	21
Singapore	10	China	20
China	8	United Arab Emirates	7
Iran	7	Singapore	6
Hong Kong, China	7	Japan	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Tea and mate	13	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	14
Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	12	Tea and mate	13
Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	11	Women, girls clothing knitted	9
Women, girls clothing knitted	8	Women, girl clothng, excl. knitted or crocheted	6
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	7	Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	10	Petroleum products	10
Petroleum products	5	Knit, crochet, fabric, n.e.s.	4
Cotton fabrics, woven	4	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	3
Knit, crochet, fabric, n.e.s.	4	Petroleum oils, crude	3
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	6.5	4.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	36.9	35.0
ODA (% of gross national income)	2.5	0.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	12.3	22.1
Total debt service (% of total exports)	10.8	21.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.72	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961811

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Sudan

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	1666.4	1347.8	1065.3	-36%
Remittances	1130.4	270.5	212.9	-81%
Other official flows (OOF)	3.6	188.0	28.3	675%
of which trade-related OOF	2.9	0.6	0.0	-100%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	2066.1	940.7	887.6	-57%
of which Aid for Trade	84.7	161.1	121.4	43%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Connecting to value chains	2	Export diversification	3	WTO accession

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Arab Fund (AFESD)	52.9	62	Arab Fund (AFESD)	53.0	44
United States	11.1	13	Kuwait	49.8	41
United Kingdom	7.0	8	EU Institutions	4.7	4
EU Institutions	4.6	5	Norway	3.0	3
Norway	3.9	5	United Kingdom	2.2	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	20.1	21.5
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	17.5
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.3	1.7
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	59.2	96.9
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	3.9	30.5
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.1
Internet users (07-17)	8.7	30.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (48), intra-regional (8), extra-regional (40)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	43	13
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	4	27
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	26	13
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	11	83
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	50	51

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	5.657	4.100		-28% ▼
	Commercial services	0.246	1.487	+503% ▲	
Imports	Goods	7.105	8.220	+16% ▲	
	Commercial services	2.454	1.259		-49% ▼

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	137
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	870	909
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.164
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.034	0.019
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	59	83
Number of import markets (max. 237)	94	154
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.624	0.215
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.062	0.084

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
China	79	United Arab Emirates	40
Japan	5	China	17
United Arab Emirates	5	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	14
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	3	Egypt	10
Egypt	1	Ethiopia	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
China	19	China	22
Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	9	United Arab Emirates	11
Japan	8	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	7
India	7	India	7
United Arab Emirates	6	Japan	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	87	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	36
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	3	Live animals	20
Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	3	Oilseed (soft fixed veg. oil)	12
Live animals	2	Petroleum oils, crude	10
Cotton	1	Cotton	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	6	Petroleum products	8
Civil engineering equipment	5	Wheat, meslin, unmilled	6
Petroleum products	5	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5	Medicaments	5
Tractors	4	Civil engineering equipment	4

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	15.3	12.8
Female labour force participation rate (%)	24.1	24.6
ODA (% of gross national income)	6.1	0.8
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	5.0	4.2
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.45	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961830

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Tajikistan

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	467.6	301.7	141.3	-70%
Remittances	1751.2	2503.4	2236.7	28%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.0	48.5	43.5	-
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	36.0	22.9	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	237.2	413.5	381.3	61%
of which Aid for Trade	47.5	200.2	186.0	292%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Trade facilitation	3	Transport infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	15.8	33	Asian Development Bank	109.4	59
United States	5.3	11	International Development Assoc.	21.1	11
Sweden	4.7	10	Japan	16.2	9
Canada	4.7	10	United States	11.8	6
Switzerland	3.5	7	Germany	10.7	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	7.9	7.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.2	2.6
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	81.6	56.7
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	. . .	22.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.1	0.1
Internet users	3.8	22.0


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (49), intra-regional (8), extra-regional (41)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	140	54
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	7	22
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	17	13
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.512	0.873		**-42%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.110	0.247	**+124%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	1.955	2.390	**+22%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.393	0.368	**-6%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	11.9	10.7
Female labour force participation rate (%)	30.1	27.9
ODA (% of gross national income)	7.6	3.7
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	4.2	26.1
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.60	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961849

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Tanzania

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	789.3	1447.4	1180.4	50%
Remittances	25.9	393.3	402.6	1455%
Other official flows (OOF)	20.1	38.7	128.6	541%
of which trade-related OOF	17.4	33.9	122.2	603%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	3766.8	2623.3	2761.0	-27%
of which Aid for Trade	397.5	817.1	797.5	101%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	**2**	Cross-border infrastructure	**3**	Transport infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	153.7	39	African Development Fund	221.5	28
EU Institutions	62.2	16	International Development Assoc.	193.3	24
African Development Fund	33.8	9	United Kingdom	70.4	9
Denmark	32.2	8	Japan	67.4	8
Sweden	23.8	6	United States	54.5	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.7	12.9
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-15)	10	8.5
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	5.0	0.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	81.6	96.1
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.0	8.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	3.2
Internet users	1.3	16.0


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (76), intra-regional (24), extra-regional (52)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	45	35
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	43	44
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	24	21
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	76	66
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	44	46

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.918	4.898	**+155%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.467	3.830	**+161%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	3.864	7.552	**+95%** ▲	
	Commercial services	1.212	1.952	**+61%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	527	573
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	958	968
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.132	0.158
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.064	0.039
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	118	133
Number of import markets (max. 237)	131	138
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.076	0.099
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.052	0.075

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Switzerland	19	India	24
South Africa	15	South Africa	17
China	8	Viet Nam	8
Germany	6	Kenya	7
Netherlands	6	Switzerland	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
South Africa	13	China	19
United Arab Emirates	11	India	15
Bahrain, Kingdom of	9	United Arab Emirates	8
China	7	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	6
Japan	6	South Africa	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	33	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	37
Precious metal ores, concentrates	10	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	13
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	9	Tobacco, unmanufactured	5
Tobacco, unmanufactured	5	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	4
Coffee, coffee substitute	4	Coffee, coffee substitute	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	23	Petroleum products	18
Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	5	Medicaments	5
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	3
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4	Civil engineering equipment	2
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Wheat, meslin, unmilled	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	3.3	1.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	87.0	79.6
ODA (% of gross national income)	10.1	5.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	2.5	8.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.46	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961868

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Thailand

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	8476.9	4167.1	7635.2	-10%
Remittances	1622.2	6229.6	6720.1	314%
Other official flows (OOF)	33.9	184.7	148.8	339%
of which trade-related OOF	20.6	130.3	120.6	486%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	413.7	513.1	555.8	34%
of which Aid for Trade	165.6	303.2	370.6	124%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Trade facilitation	2	International competitiveness	3	Regional integration

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	120.3	73	Japan	361.7	98
Germany	16.9	10	France	2.5	1
France	11.6	7	Australia	1.6	0
United States	5.6	3	Global Environment Facility	1.1	0
EU Institutions	3.4	2	EU Institutions	0.9	0

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	10.0	9.5
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	5	6.7
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	3.7	2.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	72.1	79.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	99.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.4	11.9
Internet users	17.2	52.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (110), intra-regional (17), extra-regional (93)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	135	123
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	16	24
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	22	19
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2016)	49	50
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2016)	57	57

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	127.941	235.267	**+84%** ▲	
	Commercial services	24.425	75.228	**+208%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	114.272	201.107	**+76%** ▲	
	Commercial services	32.439	46.385	**+43%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2016)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	1125	1152
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1208	1202
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.018	0.015
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.034	0.014
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	212	217
Number of import markets (max. 237)	202	205
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.062	0.049
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.075	0.090

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
United States	15	United States	11
Japan	13	China	11
China	9	Japan	10
Singapore	6	Hong Kong, China	5
Hong Kong, China	6	Australia	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Japan	20	China	22
China	11	Japan	16
United States	7	United States	6
Malaysia	7	Malaysia	6
United Arab Emirates	6	Korea, Republic of	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Automatic data processing equipment	8	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5
Transistors, valves, etc.	6	Automatic data processing equipment	5
Natural rubber, etc.	4	Transistors, valves, etc.	4
Petroleum products	3	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	3
Parts, for office machines	3	Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2016	%
Petroleum oils, crude	16	Petroleum oils, crude	8
Transistors, valves, etc.	8	Transistors, valves, etc.	6
Parts, for office machines	3	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	4
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	3
Electric switch relay circuit	3	Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.2	0.6
Female labour force participation rate (%)	64.8	59.8
ODA (% of gross national income)	-0.1	0.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	7.1	4.0
Total debt service (% of total exports)	9.4	4.7
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.70	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961887

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Togo

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	50.1	88.4	145.6	190%
Remittances	284.6	385.9	402.1	41%
Other official flows (OOF)	48.1	28.6	8.1	-83%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	28.5	8.0	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	225.3	221.8	384.9	71%
of which Aid for Trade	36.6	60.5	77.9	113%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	3. Connecting to value chains

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	27.2	74	International Development Assoc.	32.4	42
United Kingdom	2.9	8	Japan	13.8	18
EU Institutions	2.4	7	Germany	10.6	14
France	2.1	6	OPEC Fund for International Devel.	8.2	11
Germany	0.6	2	EU Institutions	6.0	8

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.0	12.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	10	11.2
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	6.9	0.1
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	66.5	97.7
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	51.5
Fixed broadband subscriptions (07-17)	0.0	0.6
Internet users	2.0	12.4


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (39), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (23)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	85	76
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	20	34
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	22	20
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2007-2017)	89	63
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2007-2017)	37	44

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.630	1.016	**+61%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.159	0.531	**+233%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.949	1.658	**+75%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.261	0.427	**+64%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2007-2017)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	163	282
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	589	705
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.217	0.052
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.085	0.028
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	70	80
Number of import markets (max. 237)	107	112
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.081	0.068
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.082	0.059


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Niger	13	Burkina Faso	18
Benin	11	Benin	14
India	10	Ghana	8
Burkina Faso	10	Niger	6
Mali	7	India	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
France	19	China	20
China	16	France	11
Netherlands	11	Japan	5
United States	4	Netherlands	5
Belgium	4	Ghana	4

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Lime, cement, construction materials	44	Lime, cement, construction materials	13
Fertilizers, crude	11	Cotton	10
Cotton	9	Articles, n.e.s., of plastics	9
Flat-rolled plated iron	6	Fertilizers, crude	9
Iron, steel bar, shapes, etc.	5	Perfumery, cosmetics, etc.	7

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2007	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	27	Petroleum products	12
Lime, cement, construction materials	8	Medicaments	6
Medicaments	6	Polymers of ethylene	4
Cotton fabrics, woven	3	Cycles, motorcycles, etc.	4
Wheat, meslin, unmilled	3	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.9	1.7
Female labour force participation rate (%)	80.6	76.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	3.7	6.9
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	21.3	20.7
Total debt service (% of total exports)	3.0	5.8
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.44	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961906

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Tonga

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	29.2	25.7	13.8	-53%
Remittances	87.8	131.8	158.6	81%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.3	1.6	1.2	314%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	1.4	0.9	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	26.9	79.7	91.5	241%
of which Aid for Trade	5.9	31.0	36.5	514%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	**2**	Export diversification	**3**	Cross-border infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Australia	3.3	55	Japan	20.4	56
New Zealand	1.7	29	International Development Assoc.	6.5	18
Japan	0.8	13	Asian Development Bank	3.9	11
United Kingdom	0.2	3	EU Institutions	2.2	6
EU Institutions	0.0	1	New Zealand	2.2	6

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	17.0	11.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	5.8
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	2.6	4.6
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	45.3	61.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	59.2
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.6	2.8
Internet users	5.9	41.2


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (13), intra-regional (7), extra-regional (6)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	64	92
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	71	79
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	19	31
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.011	0.021	**+93%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.027	0.077	**+189%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.123	0.206	**+68%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.029	0.090	**+217%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	12	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	30	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.196	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.194	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Japan	41		
United States	25		
New Zealand	15	...	
Korea, Republic of	9		
Australia	4		

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
New Zealand	33		
Fiji	28		
Australia	13	...	
United States	10		
China	5		

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	45		
Veg.	41		
Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	6	...	
Fruit, veg. juices	4		
Pigments, paints, etc.	3		

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	34		
Petroleum products	26		
Other meat, meat offal	8	...	
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3		
Paper, paperboard, cut etc.	2		

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	1.1	1.0
Female labour force participation rate (%)	45.8	45.3
ODA (% of gross national income)	7.5	18.5
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	8.6	9.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.70	0.7

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE


2006
DATA NOT AVAILABLE

2017
DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Agriculture, value added (% of GDP)
Industry, value added (% of GDP)
Services, etc., value added (% of GDP)

Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961925

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Tuvalu

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	0.6	0.3	0.3	-46%
Remittances	5.1	4.1	4.3	-15%
Other official flows (OOF)	0.3	0.2	0.1	-58%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.1	0.1	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	13.1	36.6	26.9	105%
of which Aid for Trade	4.9	17.5	17.6	260%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Connecting to value chains	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Trade finance access

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	4.4	90	International Development Assoc.	8.2	47
New Zealand	0.5	9	Asian Development Bank	4.8	28
Korea	0.0	0	New Zealand	3.1	17
Australia	0.0	0	Australia	0.8	4
			Japan	0.5	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	...	...
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	...	...
Exports: weighted avg. faced	...	...
Exports: duty free (value in %)	...	...
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	0.0
Fixed broadband subscriptions	2.5	4.0
Internet users (07-17)	10.0	49.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (0), intra-regional (0), extra-regional (0)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	95	144
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	83	18
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	50	47
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.000	0.014	**+3320%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.002	0.003	**+52%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.010	0.021	**+118%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.010	0.019	**+93%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	2	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	15	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.394	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.105	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Australia	22		
Fiji	18		
Singapore	18	...	
New Zealand	15		
Indonesia	8		

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	30		
Petroleum products	19		
Articles, n.e.s., of plastics	5	...	
Other meat, meat offal	4		
Fertilizers, crude	3		

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	. . .	. . .
Female labour force participation rate (%)	. . .	. . .
ODA (% of gross national income)	37.5	44.9
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	. . .	. . .

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961944

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Uganda

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	721.8	807.3	699.7	-3%
Remittances	528.7	978.6	1239.8	134%
Other official flows (OOF)	37.0	37.5	54.4	47%
of which trade-related OOF	33.2	35.4	31.8	-4%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	2801.6	1745.9	2069.3	-26%
of which Aid for Trade	386.1	409.2	390.6	1%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	**2**	Export diversification	**3**	International competitiveness

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	169.5	44	International Development Assoc.	116.7	30
EU Institutions	71.1	18	EU Institutions	47.3	12
African Development Fund	47.8	12	United States	42.2	11
United States	16.3	4	Japan	36.7	9
Norway	15.3	4	United Kingdom	26.9	7

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	12.7	12.7
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-16)	12	11.3
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.1	2.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	96.8	92.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	1.6	23.4
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.3
Internet users	2.5	23.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (61), intra-regional (15), extra-regional (46)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	46	46
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	28	28
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	25	28
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	60	65
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	42	44

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.188	3.450	**+190%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.458	1.375	**+200%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	2.216	5.164	**+133%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.756	2.048	**+171%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	392	575
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	875	933
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.085	0.066
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.050	0.041
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	101	110
Number of import markets (max. 237)	120	122
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.071	0.080
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.060	0.077


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United Arab Emirates	19	Kenya	19
Sudan	10	United Arab Emirates	15
Kenya	9	South Sudan	10
Netherlands	6	Congo, Dem. Rep. of	7
Switzerland	5	Rwanda	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Kenya	16	China	18
United Arab Emirates	13	India	13
India	8	United Arab Emirates	12
Japan	7	Kenya	8
South Africa	6	Japan	7

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Coffee, coffee substitute	20	Coffee, coffee substitute	19
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	14	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	14
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	13	Petroleum products	4
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	6	Veg.	4
Tea and mate	5	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	20	Petroleum products	18
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	5	Fixed veg. fat, oils, other	5
Wheat, meslin, unmilled	4	Medicaments	4
Medicaments	4	Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	3	Wheat, meslin, unmilled	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.1	1.7
Female labour force participation rate (%)	65.2	67.0
ODA (% of gross national income)	16.4	7.9
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	. . .	11.7
Total debt service (% of total exports)	5.6	3.8
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.45	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961963

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Ukraine

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	8802.7	2218.3	2202.0	-75%
Remittances	5058.0	8433.3	12132.0	140%
Other official flows (OOF)	412.4	1777.3	575.5	40%
of which trade-related OOF	206.2	1486.0	441.4	114%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	469.9	1484.8	1194.0	154%
of which Aid for Trade	159.3	227.8	243.9	53%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	Trade policy

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	81.7	51	EU Institutions	144.1	59
United States	47.4	30	Germany	29.3	12
Germany	7.7	5	United States	26.3	11
Canada	5.3	3	Canada	9.2	4
Sweden	4.6	3	Norway	7.8	3

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	6.8	4.5
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	. . .	2.9
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	1.9	5.1
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	79.2	77.2
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	4.1	41.7
Fixed broadband subscriptions	1.1	12.6
Internet users	4.5	57.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (97), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (88)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	92	103
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	24	26
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	17	20
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	76	81
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	37	38

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	36.174	39.701	**+10%** ▲	
	Commercial services	11.713	13.860	**+18%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	42.220	49.364	**+17%** ▲	
	Commercial services	8.623	12.231	**+42%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	987
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	1143
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.032
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	0.020
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	164	187
Number of import markets (max. 237)	159	171
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.065	0.030
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.115	0.060


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Russian Federation	23	Russian Federation	9
Italy	7	Poland	6
Turkey	6	Turkey	6
Poland	4	Italy	6
Germany	3	India	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Russian Federation	31	Russian Federation	15
Germany	9	China	11
Turkmenistan	8	Germany	11
China	5	Poland	7
Poland	5	Belarus	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Ingots etc. iron or steel	11	Fixed veg. fat, oils, soft	10
Flat-rolled iron etc.	9	Maize unmilled	7
Iron, steel bar, shapes, etc.	8	Wheat, meslin, unmilled	6
Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	5	Iron ore, concentrates	6
Petroleum products	4	Ingots etc. iron or steel	6

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Natural gas	11	Petroleum products	8
Petroleum oils, crude	10	Natural gas	6
Petroleum products	5	Coal, not agglomerated	6
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	4
Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	3	Medicaments	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	6.8	9.5
Female labour force participation rate (%)	48.5	46.9
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.5	1.0
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	7.4	4.0
Total debt service (% of total exports)	19.0	20.7
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.72	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933961982

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Uzbekistan

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	530.1	319.1	95.8	-82%
Remittances	1865.8	3789.7	...	-
Other official flows (OOF)	38.6	809.8	476.1	1134%
of which trade-related OOF	28.8	636.8	272.7	846%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	148.8	465.2	696.5	368%
of which Aid for Trade	49.8	230.9	482.3	868%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	WTO accession	**2**	Regional integration	**3**	Export diversification

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	20.1	40	Japan	267.1	55
United States	14.2	28	Asian Development Bank	163.1	34
Germany	6.1	12	International Development Assoc.	17.7	4
International Development Assoc.	4.4	9	Korea	16.8	3
Korea	1.5	3	EU Institutions	9.7	2

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (06-15)	15.6	14.8
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	...	...
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-14)	7.3	0.7
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-14)	72.7	83.8
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	14.4	59.4
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	10.4
Internet users	6.4	52.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (59), intra-regional (9), extra-regional (50)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	64	54
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	12	25
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	8	8
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	...	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	...	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	5.617	10.388	**+85%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.773	3.506	**+353%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	4.380	12.035	**+175%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.402	0.978	**+144%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	. . .	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	. . .	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	. . .	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE

Exports

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Imports

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Other commercial services
Travel
Transport
Goods-related services

Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE

Exports 2006

2017

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Imports 2006

2017

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

Agriculture
Fuels and mining
Manufacturing

Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
...		...	

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	5.9	5.0
Female labour force participation rate (%)	52.3	53.4
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.9	1.3
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	5.2
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	. . .
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.63	0.7

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962001

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Vanuatu

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	57.4	10.9	24.7	-57%
Remittances	6.5	23.7	19.4	199%
Other official flows (OOF)	1.3	0.8	0.3	-75%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	0.4	0.3	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	66.6	141.9	135.0	103%
of which Aid for Trade	21.7	39.9	66.6	207%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Transport infrastructure	**2**	Services development	**3**	Trade facilitation

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
United States	8.0	37	Japan	27.2	41
Japan	5.5	26	Australia	11.5	17
France	4.8	22	International Development Assoc.	9.1	14
EU Institutions	1.5	7	Asian Development Bank	9.0	14
Australia	1.0	4	New Zealand	7.1	11

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	16.3	9.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied	. . .	. . .
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	3.1	1.5
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	41.1	84.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	45.4
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	1.6
Internet users	5.9	25.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (19), intra-regional (12), extra-regional (7)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	89	91
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	79	91
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	31	31
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	50	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s)	31	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	0.038	0.033		**-11%** ▼
	Commercial services	0.140	0.344	**+146%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	0.148	0.283	**+91%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.066	0.128	**+93%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2007-2017)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	54	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	598	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.146	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.036	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	29	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	50	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.061	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.198	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Fiji	12		
Australia	8		
New Caledonia	7	...	
Belgium	5		
Singapore	5		

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Australia	41		
New Zealand	16		
Fiji	9	...	
Singapore	5		
China	5		

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	37		
Veg.	18		
Bovine meat	8	...	
Oilseed (other fixed veg. oil)	8		
Cocoa	7		

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	11		
Rice	5		
Medicaments	5	...	
Furniture, cushions, etc.	3		
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	2		

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	5.8	5.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	61.1	61.5
ODA (% of gross national income)	11.8	15.5
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2006-2016)	. . .	22.1
Total debt service (% of total exports, 2006-2016)	2.1	2.1
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.58	0.6

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:

$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE

INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:

lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962020

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	1802.3	269.7	-68.0	-
Remittances	151.0	189.3	293.3	94%
Other official flows (OOF)	2.9	144.8	17.6	505%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	43.8	5.9	27014%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	60.6	43.4	88.8	46%
of which Aid for Trade	2.2	2.3	0.7	-67%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Export diversification	2	Trade facilitation	3	Trade policy

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	0.9	44	United Kingdom	0.2	26
Spain	0.3	15	EU Institutions	0.1	17
EU Institutions	0.2	10	Japan	0.1	16
United States	0.2	9	United Arab Emirates	0.1	14
Italy	0.2	8	UNICEF	0.1	11

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	13.0	13.8
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	12.6
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.1	0.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	98.4	75.1
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	21.4	49.2
Fixed broadband subscriptions	2.0	8.2
Internet users	15.2	64.3


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (59), intra-regional (18), extra-regional (41)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	58	...
Commercial services as % of total exports (%, 2006-2016)	2	4
Commercial services as % of total imports (%, 2006-2016)	15	36
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s)	7	...
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s)	33	...

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	65.574	27.399		-58% ▼
	Commercial services	1.445	1.242		-14% ▼
Imports	Goods	33.547	16.338		-51% ▼
	Commercial services	5.782	9.068	+57% ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	550	...
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1112	...
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.839	...
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.050	...
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	93	...
Number of import markets (max. 237)	121	...
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.446	...
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.121	...


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	51		
LAIA, nes	17		
Neth. Antilles	6	...	
Other Asia, nes	4		
Spain	3		

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	24		
Brazil	8		
Colombia	8	...	
China	5		
Mexico	5		

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	92		
Aluminium	2		
Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	2	...	
Flat-rolled iron etc.	1		
Petroleum products	0		

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Special transactions not classified	20		
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6		
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	6	...	
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3		
Medicaments	2		


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	8.6	7.4
Female labour force participation rate (%)	50.7	47.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	0.0	. . .
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports, 2006-2016)	7.5	57.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.73	0.8


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962039

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Viet Nam

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	6320.0	11200.0	14100.0	123%
Remittances	5595.0	12360.0	13780.8	146%
Other official flows (OOF)	237.5	1718.9	1927.9	712%
of which trade-related OOF	195.7	1585.0	1641.6	739%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	2316.6	4194.2	3380.9	46%
of which Aid for Trade	1031.5	2437.1	1760.0	71%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	2	Regional integration	3	Connecting to value chains

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
Japan	516.3	50	Japan	887.7	50
International Development Assoc.	299.5	29	International Development Assoc.	354.5	20
France	64.2	6	Asian Development Bank	133.2	8
Germany	20.9	2	Korea	100.9	6
Denmark	18.0	2	Germany	82.6	5

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	16.8	9.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	5.6
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	5.8	3.3
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	48.1	73.9
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	7.9	46.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.6	11.8
Internet users	17.3	49.6


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (102), intra-regional (20), extra-regional (82)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	139	200
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	11	6
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	11	8
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	23	36
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	62	70

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	39.826	214.135	**+438%** ▲	
	Commercial services	5.060	12.948	**+156%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	42.602	202.640	**+376%** ▲	
	Commercial services	5.082	16.824	**+231%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	986	1064
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	1172	1169
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.055	0.035
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.024	0.020
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	173	141
Number of import markets (max. 237)	166	138
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.082	0.081
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.091	0.153


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
United States	20	United States	19
Japan	13	China	16
Australia	9	Japan	8
China	8	Korea, Republic of	7
Singapore	4	Hong Kong, China	4

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
China	16	China	27
Singapore	14	Korea, Republic of	22
Other Asia, nes	11	Japan	8
Japan	10	Other Asia, nes	6
Korea, Republic of	9	Thailand	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	21	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	24
Footwear	9	Footwear	7
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	5	Transistors, valves, etc.	4
Furniture, cushions, etc.	4	Other textile apparel, n.e.s.	4
Mens, boys clothing, x-knit	4	Furniture, cushions, etc.	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	14	Transistors, valves, etc.	11
Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	4	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	11
Fabrics, man-made fibres	3	Petroleum products	4
Flat-rolled iron etc.	3	Electric switch relay circuit	3
Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3	Other machinery, parts, specialized industries	2


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	2.2	1.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	71.6	72.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	2.6	1.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	2.1	5.9
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.62	0.7


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS




ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962058

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Yemen

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	1197.6	-269.9	-269.9	-
Remittances	1338.2	3490.5	3350.5	150%
Other official flows (OOF)	162.6	6.3	7.3	-95%
of which trade-related OOF	162.6	0.4	0.0	-100%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	417.6	1866.7	3316.3	694%
of which Aid for Trade	75.4	252.7	276.5	267%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Network infrastructure	**2**	Transport infrastructure	**3**	Industrialization

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
International Development Assoc.	32.0	42	International Development Assoc.	229.9	83
Arab Fund (AFESD)	26.9	36	United Arab Emirates	40.6	15
Italy	4.0	5	EU Institutions	4.2	2
EU Institutions	3.3	4	Germany	1.6	1
Korea	2.7	4	United States	0.1	0

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	7.1	7.6
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-15)	. . .	6.3
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	0.5	0.0
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	83.2	100.0
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.0	5.9
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	1.7
Internet users	1.2	26.7


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (36), intra-regional (7), extra-regional (29)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%, 2006-2016)	81	25
Commercial services as % of total exports (%, 2006-2016)	6	39
Commercial services as % of total imports (%, 2006-2016)	23	18
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. exp.s, 2006-2015)	3	25
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merch. imp.s, 2006-2015)	45	51

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	7.316	0.473		-94% ▼
	Commercial services	0.468	0.309		-34% ▼
Imports	Goods	5.926	6.798	+15% ▲	
	Commercial services	1.800	1.450		-19% ▼

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.; 2006-2015)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	342	244
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	922	811
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.722	0.043
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.058	0.036
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	81	57
Number of import markets (max. 237)	104	104
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.136	0.170
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.043	0.050

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
India	24	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	32
China	23	Oman	17
Thailand	15	Somalia	7
United States	6	Japan	5
United Kingdom	6	United Arab Emirates	5

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
United Arab Emirates	10	United Arab Emirates	11
Japan	9	China	11
Switzerland	8	Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of	9
China	7	Turkey	7
Kuwait	6	India	6

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
Petroleum oils, crude	85	Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	18
Petroleum products	7	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	11
Fish, fresh, chilled, frozen	1	Fruit, nuts excl. oil nuts	9
Civil engineering equipment	1	Rotating electric plant	6
Crustaceans, molluscs etc	1	Parts, tractors, motor vehicles	5

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2015	%
Petroleum products	21	Wheat, meslin, unmilled	12
Wheat, meslin, unmilled	6	Petroleum products	10
Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	5	Passenger motor vehicles, excl. buses	6
Tubes, pipes, etc., iron, steel	5	Rice	5
Civil engineering equipment	3	Iron, steel bar, shapes, etc.	3


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	11.6	13.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	13.4	6.1
ODA (% of gross national income, 2006-2016)	1.6	8.5
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports, 2006-2016)	2.9	14.6
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.48	0.5


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962077

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Zambia

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	959.4	1152.2	1091.2	14%
Remittances	61.7	47.9	93.6	52%
Other official flows (OOF)	67.9	88.0	51.2	-25%
of which trade-related OOF	32.6	85.9	21.8	-33%
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	2313.6	993.4	1133.6	-51%
of which Aid for Trade	144.5	274.6	203.5	41%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	**2**	Trade facilitation	**3**	3. Network infrastructure

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
EU Institutions	41.6	29	International Development Assoc.	42.4	21
International Development Assoc.	29.3	20	EU Institutions	29.0	14
Denmark	12.2	8	Sweden	21.6	11
Japan	11.9	8	United Kingdom	21.5	11
Norway	10.7	7	African Development Fund	19.6	10

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied (05-16)	13.9	13.9
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (05-15)	11	12.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	2.9	1.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	84.5	82.6
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	0.2	45.2
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.0	0.2
Internet users	4.2	27.9


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (59), intra-regional (18), extra-regional (41)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE


INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	60	71
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	12	10
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	16	16
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	96	95
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	47	58

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	3.985	8.216	**+106%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.562	0.865	**+54%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	2.636	7.851	**+198%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.488	1.467	**+201%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE




Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	405	499
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	965	982
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.229	0.288
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.019	0.030
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	78	83
Number of import markets (max. 237)	99	135
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.186	0.244
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.237	0.140

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Switzerland	40	Switzerland	45
South Africa	11	China	16
Thailand	8	Congo, Dem. Rep. of	7
China	7	Singapore	6
Egypt	4	South Africa	6

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
South Africa	47	South Africa	28
United Arab Emirates	10	Congo, Dem. Rep. of	21
Zimbabwe	6	China	13
Norway	4	United Arab Emirates	5
United Kingdom	4	Kuwait	5

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Copper	69	Copper	75
Copper ores, concentrates	11	Inorganic chemical elements	3
Manufactures base metals, n.e.s.	4	Manufactures base metals, n.e.s.	2
Tobacco, unmanufactured	2	Sugars, molasses, honey	2
Cotton	2	Printed matter	1

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum oils, crude	8	Copper ores, concentrates	10
Other machinery, parts, specialized industries	6	Inorganic chemical elements	8
Petroleum products	6	Petroleum products	8
Civil engineering equipment	5	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	6
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	5	Petroleum oils, crude	5


Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	12.5	7.2
Female labour force participation rate (%)	73.2	70.7
ODA (% of gross national income)	12.7	4.1
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue, 2007-2016)	10.5	5.8
Total debt service (% of total exports)	3.2	18.1
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.49	0.6


Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS




Source: WB, World Development Indicators

INEQUALITY INDICATORS



GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962096

Aid, Trade and Development Indicators for Zimbabwe

A. DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

EXTERNAL FINANCING INFLOWS (million current USD)	2006/08	2014/16	2017	Δ:06/08-17
FDI inflows	53.5	445.9	289.4	441%
Remittances	...	1935.5	1729.9	-
Other official flows (OOF)	1.5	1.6	3.7	148%
of which trade-related OOF	0.0	1.2	1.6	-
Official Development Assistance (ODA)	446.2	777.7	729.7	64%
of which Aid for Trade	11.4	66.1	53.7	371%


Sources: UNCTAD, UNCTADstat; WB, World Development Indicators; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

TOP 3 AfT PRIORITIES

1	Industrialization	**2**	Connecting to value chains	**3**	Export diversification

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Questionnaire

SHARE OF AfT IN DEVELOPMENT FINANCE AND FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION (%)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSMENTS: TOP DONORS (million current USD)

2006/08	value	%	2017	value	%
France	4.8	42	United Kingdom	18.3	34
Germany	1.6	14	Japan	8.3	15
EU Institutions	1.4	12	United States	6.6	12
Japan	1.0	9	EU Institutions	6.2	12
Ireland	1.0	9	Germany	4.7	9

Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

AfT DISBURSEMENTS BY SECTOR (million current USD)




Source: OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database

B. TRADE COSTS

INDICATORS	2006	2017
Tariffs (%)		
Imports: simple avg. MFN applied	...	17.2
Imports: weighted avg. MFN applied (06-16)	...	12.0
Exports: weighted avg. faced (05-16)	3.8	6.2
Exports: duty free (value in %) (05-16)	73.9	58.5
ICT connectivity (% of population)		
Mobile broadband subscriptions (10-17)	4.3	41.3
Fixed broadband subscriptions	0.1	1.1
Internet users	2.4	27.1


Sources: WTO, World Tariff Profiles; ITU, World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators

LOGISTICS PERFORMANCE INDICES (LPI) (1-5)




Source: WB Logistics Performance Index (LPI)

TRADE FACILITATION INDICATORS, 2017 (0-2)




Source: OECD Trade Facilitation Indicators

Cost to trade (USD), 2018:




Time to trade (hours), 2018:




Source: WB, Doing Business

TRADE COSTS (ad-valorem, %)



Source: ESCAP-WB Trade Cost Database
Note: Number of partners used in the calculation of average trade costs: total (45), intra-regional (16), extra-regional (29)

COMPETITIVENESS INDICATORS (1-7)



Source: WEF Global Competitiveness Index

C. TRADE PERFORMANCE

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Trade to GDP ratio (%)	91	51
Commercial services as % of total exports (%)	14	8
Commercial services as % of total imports (%)	17	16
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise exports)	34	93
Non-fuel intermediates (% of merchandise imports)	46	40

Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade


TRADE FLOWS (billion current USD)		2006	2017	Increase	Decrease
Exports	Goods	1.874	4.296	**+129%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.294	0.371	**+26%** ▲	
Imports	Goods	2.319	5.467	**+136%** ▲	
	Commercial services	0.485	1.072	**+121%** ▲	

Sources: WTO Secretariat

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Product diversification (based on HS02, 4-dig.)		
Number of exported products (max. 1,245)	504	409
Number of imported products (max. 1,245)	927	935
HH export product concentration (0 to 1)	0.146	0.151
HH import product concentration (0 to 1)	0.055	0.072
Market diversification		
Number of export markets (max. 237)	113	61
Number of import markets (max. 237)	94	107
HH export market concentration (0 to 1)	0.138	0.560
HH import market concentration (0 to 1)	0.228	0.220


Sources: WTO Secretariat; UN Comtrade

STRUCTURE OF SERVICES TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* For goods-related services, no value label is provided in the case of missing data or zero trade.

STRUCTURE OF MERCHANDISE TRADE



Source: WTO Secretariat *Note:* Only classified products are included in the calculation.

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Zambia	26	South Africa	63
South Africa	17	Mozambique	10
Congo, Dem. Rep. of	15	United Arab Emirates	6
Netherlands	14	Zambia	2
Mozambique	6	Belgium	2

TOP 5 MARKETS FOR MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
South Africa	45	South Africa	41
United States	9	Singapore	22
Botswana	8	China	9
Mozambique	8	Zambia	3
China	4	Japan	2

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE EXPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Coke, semi-coke, retort carbon	35	Gold, nonmontry excl. ores	25
Crude veg. materials, n.e.s.	12	Nickel ores, concentrates, mattes	23
Veg.	7	Tobacco, unmanufactured	23
Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	5	Pig iron, spiegeleisn, etc.	8
Nickel ores, concentrates, mattes	5	Ore, concentrate base metals	3

Source: UN Comtrade

TOP 5 MERCHANDISE IMPORTS (%)

2006	%	2017	%
Petroleum products	21	Petroleum products	26
Fixed veg. fat, oils, soft	7	Fertilizer, except crude fertilizers	4
Copper ores, concentrates	6	Electric current	4
Maize unmilled	4	Medicaments	3
Goods, special-purpose transport vehicles	3	Telecomm. equipment parts, n.e.s.	3

Source: UN Comtrade

D. DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

INDICATOR	2006	2017
Unemployment (% of total labour force)	4.1	4.9
Female labour force participation rate (%)	77.1	78.4
ODA (% of gross national income)	5.4	4.6
Import duties collected (% of tax revenue)	. . .	. . .
Total debt service (% of total exports)	. . .	8.4
Human Development Index (0-1)	0.44	0.5

Sources: ILO, ILOSTAT; OECD, DAC-CRS Aid Activities Database; WB, World Development Indicators; UNDP, International Human Development Indicators

POVERTY INDICATORS

Population (%) living below:
$1.90 a day (PPP) $3.20 a day (PPP)

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


INEQUALITY INDICATORS

Income (%) held by:
lowest 20% lowest 40%

DATA NOT AVAILABLE


Source: WB, World Development Indicators

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

GDP PER CAPITA (constant 2011 international $)



Source: WB, World Development Indicators

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962115

STATISTICAL NOTES

According to the WTO Task Force on Aid for Trade, projects and programmes are part of aid for trade if these activities have been identified as trade related development priorities in the partner country's national development strategies. Furthermore, the WTO Task Force concluded that to measure aid for trade flows the following categories should be included:

a) Technical assistance for trade policy and regulations: for example, helping countries to develop trade strategies, negotiate trade agreements, and implement their outcomes;

b) Trade-related infrastructure: for example, building roads, ports, and telecommunications networks to connect domestic markets to the global economy;

c) Productive capacity building (including trade development): for example, supporting the private sector to exploit their comparative advantages and diversify their exports;

d) Trade-related adjustment: helping developing countries with the costs associated with trade liberalisation, such as tariff reductions, preference erosion, or declining terms of trade; and,

e) Other trade-related needs: if identified as trade-related development priorities in partner countries' national development strategies.

The OECD DAC aid activity database (CRS) – a database covering around 90% of all ODA - is recognised as the best available data source for tracking global aid-for-trade flows. The CRS was established in 1967 and collects information on official development assistance (ODA) and other official flows (OOF) to developing countries. It is the internationally recognised source of data on aid activities (geographical and sectoral breakdowns) and is widely used by governments, organisations and researchers active in the field of development. For the OECD, the CRS serves as a tool for monitoring specific policy issues, including aid for trade. The CRS enables the tracking of aid commitments and disbursements, and provides comparable data over time and across countries. The use of this existing database led to significant savings of time and resources to effectively track aid-for-trade flows. The policy and guidelines for CRS reporting are approved by DAC members as represented at the DAC Working Party on Statistics (WP-STAT). The OECD collects, collates and verifies the consistency of the data, and maintains the database.

It should be kept in mind that the CRS does not provide data that match exactly all of the above aid-for-trade categories. In fact, the CRS provides proxies under four headings:

- **Trade policy and regulations.** In the CRS, five purpose codes are used to cover trade policy and regulations activities. These five sub-categories are: trade policy and administrative management; trade facilitation; regional trade agreements; multilateral trade negotiations; and trade education/training.
- **Economic infrastructure.** Amounts relating to trade-related infrastructure are provided in the CRS by data under the heading "Economic Infrastructure and Services" and cover the sectors transport and storage, communications and energy generation and supply.
- **Building Productive capacity (BPC), including trade development.** The CRS captures full data on all activities in the productive and services sectors, such as agriculture; industry; mineral resources and mining; business; and banking. Trade development activities are identified through the *Trade Development policy marker* and have been separately identified in the CRS data collection since

2007 flows. These activities are an "of which" of *Building Productive Capacity* and are scored as either principally or significantly contributing to trade development. However, at time of reporting, some donors may have difficulty in identifying aid activities that have a defined trade component. This may reflect upon the accuracy of these data and, as such, amounts shown under trade development can only at best be used as approximations.

- **Trade-related adjustment.** Was introduced in the CRS as a separate data item in 2007 to track flows corresponding to trade-related adjustment. This category identifies contributions to developing country budgets to assist the implementation of trade reforms and adjustments to trade policy measures by other countries, and alleviate shortfalls in balance-of-payments due to changes in the world trading environment.

The CRS covers all ODA, but only those activities reported under the above four categories can be identified as aid for trade. It is not possible to distinguish activities in the context of *'Other trade-related needs'*. To estimate the volume of such 'other' activities, it would be necessary 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. Consequently, accurate monitoring of aid for trade would require comparison of the CRS data with providers and partner countries' self-assessments of their aid for trade.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLES IN ANNEX A

Most of the data shown in Annex A are sourced from the CRS. To view the full set of CRS data please visit: www.oecd.org/dac/stats/idsonline

Providers of aid for trade and trade-related other official flows:

The list of aid providers is split into DAC member countries, other bilateral donors and multilateral organisations. The full names of organisations are listed under the Acronyms section.

Korea became a member of the DAC in 2010 and was joined in 2013 by the Czech Republic, Iceland, Poland, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia. Data shown in previous years for these countries may be partial.

Data collected from the EIF, FAO, IMF, ITC UNESCAP, UNESCWA, UNIDO, WTO and Turkey comprise specialised reporting as from 2007 on Aid for Trade flows and may not constitute the totality of their individual aid funding.

The **Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)** changed its reporting methodology to the CRS as from 2009 flows.

"Other multilateral donors" include small amounts from several multilateral agencies (GGGI, AITIC, Nordic Development Fund, UNPBF, UNICEF).

Aid recipients:

The DAC List of ODA Recipients represents all countries and territories eligible to receive official development assistance (ODA). These ODA-eligible recipients consist of low and middle income countries based on gross national income (GNI) per capita as published by the World Bank, with the exception of G8 members, EU members, and countries with a firm date for entry into the EU. The low-income countries include the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) as defined by the United Nations. See the Annexes to view the DAC List of Aid Recipients by income group and region. A full historic of graduations to and from the DAC List can be viewed at: http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/daclist.htm

Channels of delivery:

The list shown in Table A.11 represents major headings for channels of delivery in the CRS. The full list under each category (updated in 6 July 2016), is accessible at: http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/annex2.htm.

The category "Other" represents channels of delivery such as: Universities, colleges, or other teaching institutions, research institutes or think-tanks.

Sector allocable aid:

As from 2010 the method used to calculate sector allocable aid has changed. In order to measure donors' intention, the calculation is now based on types of aid. This allows the inclusion of unpredictable aid that has a specific policy. For example, humanitarian aid is unpredictable but allows practices targeting gender equality. Aid where the donor has no control on the spending has been removed such as sector budget support and core support to NGOs.

Legend:

".." denotes zero.

0.0 denotes amounts of less than USD 0.5 million.

0.0% denotes a percentage of less than 0.5%

ANNEX A
AID-FOR-TRADE KEY DATA

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.1. Aid for trade by category

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Trade Policy & Regulations													
Trade Policy and Admin. Management	581.9	666.0	635.8	529.3	676.7	472.4	700.2	468.9	523.7	500.0	426.4	546.4	738.8
Trade Facilitation	68.7	173.9	393.1	515.0	327.9	430.0	649.8	114.4	262.9	430.5	425.2	411.2	362.8
Regional Trade Agreements	74.2	115.3	232.5	175.5	41.0	31.8	42.4	64.0	124.8	149.2	96.4	141.6	81.9
Multilateral Trade Negotiations	14.4	39.6	17.8	9.2	7.7	7.8	5.6	23.7	32.5	18.9	16.1	13.6	7.5
Trade Education/Training	9.7	30.2	32.7	21.5	34.3	30.2	26.3	20.7	30.6	23.6	33.0	34.6	25.9
Sub-total	**748.8**	**1 025.0**	**1 311.9**	**1 250.5**	**1 087.6**	**972.1**	**1 424.3**	**691.7**	**974.5**	**1 122.3**	**997.0**	**1 147.4**	**1 216.9**
Economic Infrastructure													
Transport and Storage	6 297.9	9 309.9	12 084.7	14 719.0	16 381.1	18 277.6	17 773.3	5 882.3	8 677.6	11 309.1	11 123.8	10 970.4	12 314.7
Communications	601.5	473.4	609.0	819.3	579.3	582.2	749.2	459.5	551.9	649.1	457.3	554.7	650.5
Energy Generation and Supply	5 206.0	6 566.4	9 235.9	13 771.4	16 748.8	13 587.9	14 347.9	4 544.3	6 186.3	8 290.9	9 778.9	9 640.8	10 896.4
Sub-total	**12 105.4**	**16 349.7**	**21 929.6**	**29 309.6**	**33 709.2**	**32 447.7**	**32 870.3**	**10 886.1**	**15 415.8**	**20 249.0**	**21 359.9**	**21 165.9**	**23 861.7**
Building Productive Capacity													
Business And Other Services	1 293.3	1 969.4	1 888.2	1 719.3	1 952.3	1 902.0	2 085.0	1 795.1	1 558.2	1 584.4	2 050.8	1 846.4	1 570.8
Banking & Financial Services	1 643.7	2 330.1	3 069.7	4 892.7	5 401.7	4 099.4	5 152.2	2 007.4	3 183.5	4 134.6	5 633.3	4 697.9	4 472.2
Agriculture	3 908.3	5 680.9	7 712.0	8 731.4	9 842.4	8 979.1	10 634.9	3 897.8	6 027.5	6 276.5	7 400.8	7 644.3	7 484.7
Forestry	515.3	596.4	675.3	741.7	767.6	648.5	983.2	518.1	723.0	628.9	753.8	561.3	805.0
Fishing	242.7	333.6	445.0	338.2	351.7	498.0	963.5	258.4	327.3	280.5	234.8	364.6	544.2
Industry	1 776.3	1 563.8	1 940.0	2 150.0	2 482.3	1 665.6	2 692.8	1 192.4	1 619.9	1 748.5	1 801.3	1 442.0	2 427.5
Mineral Resources and Mining	832.2	388.7	426.0	558.8	578.8	157.8	575.4	431.8	284.1	737.3	450.7	405.0	481.4
Tourism	94.3	201.7	169.6	117.0	92.7	196.1	401.3	66.5	134.4	171.9	168.1	190.3	197.0
Sub-total	**10 306.1**	**13 064.6**	**16 325.8**	**19 249.2**	**21 469.7**	**18 146.6**	**23 488.3**	**10 167.4**	**13 857.9**	**15 562.6**	**18 493.7**	**17 151.9**	**17 982.8**
Trade-related Adjustment													
Trade-related Adjustment	..	2.0	20.7	2.2	2.3	21.3	0.8	7.8	36.4	14.6	13.5	10.5	5.4
Sub-total	**..**	**2.0**	**20.7**	**2.2**	**2.3**	**21.3**	**0.8**	**7.8**	**36.4**	**14.6**	**13.5**	**10.5**	**5.4**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**	**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**
Focus on Trade Development													
Principal objective	..	1 001.4	2 478.6	2 950.9	3 771.5	2 995.4	3 546.3	907.3	2 006.6	2 910.0	3 647.5	4 046.5	3 230.1
Significant objective	..	1 330.9	2 568.3	1 814.8	2 578.3	2 519.4	4 572.5	568.8	2 112.1	1 713.5	2 191.5	1 847.7	2 584.5
TOTAL	**..**	**2 332.3**	**5 046.9**	**4 765.7**	**6 349.8**	**5 514.8**	**8 118.7**	**1 476.2**	**4 118.6**	**4 623.5**	**5 839.0**	**5 894.2**	**5 814.6**
Share in total Aid for Trade													
Trade Policy & Regulations	*3.2%*	*3.4%*	*3.3%*	*2.5%*	*1.9%*	*1.9%*	*2.4%*	*3.2%*	*3.2%*	*3.0%*	*2.4%*	*2.9%*	*2.8%*
Economic Infrastructure	*52.3%*	*53.7%*	*55.4%*	*58.8%*	*59.9%*	*62.9%*	*56.9%*	*50.0%*	*50.9%*	*54.8%*	*52.3%*	*53.6%*	*55.4%*
Building Productive Capacity	*44.5%*	*42.9%*	*41.2%*	*38.6%*	*38.2%*	*35.2%*	*40.7%*	*46.7%*	*45.8%*	*42.1%*	*45.3%*	*43.4%*	*41.8%*
Trade-related Adjustment	..	*0.0%*	*0.1%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.1%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*
Share in sector allocable aid	***30.6%***	***31.2%***	***33.3%***	***38.8%***	***38.3%***	***38.0%***	***39.8%***	***28.6%***	***30.6%***	***34.3%***	***35.6%***	***33.4%***	***34.7%***
Share in total ODA	***19.8%***	***26.1%***	***25.9%***	***30.2%***	***28.3%***	***27.1%***	***29.4%***	***22.9%***	***22.1%***	***25.0%***	***22.9%***	***21.4%***	***22.6%***

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink https://doi.org/10.1787/888933962514

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.2. Aid for trade by category and region

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Africa													
Trade Policy & Regulations	370.9	352.9	425.7	427.0	490.4	291.1	470.0	203.3	317.1	387.2	377.6	418.7	320.0
Economic Infrastructure	3 459.5	5 955.5	8 205.5	10 336.8	10 755.0	10 775.5	11 756.8	3 592.3	5 353.0	7 402.5	7 922.3	8 148.1	7 982.4
Building Productive Capacity	3 267.7	4 548.5	6 047.0	7 177.3	7 722.7	7 717.9	9 514.8	3 354.6	5 060.4	5 843.3	6 064.2	6 174.3	6 900.4
Trade-related Adjustment	..	1.4	4.8	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.3	7.5	26.2	1.2	0.3	0.1	0.6
Sub-total	**7 098.2**	**10 858.3**	**14 683.1**	**17 941.2**	**18 968.1**	**18 786.8**	**21 741.9**	**7 157.7**	**10 756.7**	**13 634.2**	**14 364.3**	**14 741.2**	**15 203.4**
America													
Trade Policy & Regulations	62.7	109.5	169.4	75.4	71.3	66.7	34.4	83.0	93.3	94.8	89.7	68.6	59.6
Economic Infrastructure	451.8	720.1	1 319.8	2 385.9	2 647.4	2 295.8	3 346.7	421.0	1 147.6	1 714.8	1 589.9	1 575.6	2 096.7
Building Productive Capacity	1 093.3	1 126.1	1 492.8	1 417.0	1 504.4	1 410.4	1 365.0	1 024.9	1 418.3	1 242.8	1 202.6	1 524.2	1 145.5
Trade-related Adjustment	..	0.3	12.8	0.0	0.0	18.7	0.1	0.0	5.7	9.2	11.4	7.6	3.0
Sub-total	**1 607.8**	**1 956.0**	**2 994.6**	**3 878.4**	**4 223.1**	**3 791.7**	**4 746.2**	**1 528.9**	**2 664.9**	**3 061.7**	**2 893.6**	**3 176.0**	**3 304.7**
Asia													
Trade Policy & Regulations	151.4	247.3	295.2	361.7	181.7	352.2	631.5	173.2	261.2	280.1	245.7	379.3	508.1
Economic Infrastructure	7 168.8	8 440.8	9 922.2	13 163.1	18 284.7	16 444.4	14 974.5	5 897.2	6 588.7	8 610.4	10 005.8	8 940.7	11 421.0
Building Productive Capacity	4 499.2	5 154.2	4 924.3	5 454.2	6 804.4	4 304.4	6 508.5	4 052.7	4 378.3	4 119.3	5 232.2	4 079.8	4 701.4
Trade-related Adjustment	..	0.2	2.9	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.4	3.0	2.1	0.1	1.1	0.9
Sub-total	**11 819.4**	**13 842.6**	**15 144.6**	**18 979.3**	**25 270.8**	**21 101.3**	**22 114.6**	**10 123.5**	**11 231.2**	**13 011.9**	**15 483.9**	**13 400.9**	**16 631.4**
Europe													
Trade Policy & Regulations	24.8	76.0	63.2	72.8	23.4	25.0	63.8	25.1	49.9	51.0	39.7	28.4	86.0
Economic Infrastructure	702.3	769.3	1 472.4	2 647.0	914.7	2 170.6	1 608.8	668.1	1 491.5	1 915.5	1 276.0	1 850.4	1 620.1
Building Productive Capacity	579.0	650.5	1 176.3	2 639.1	2 302.2	2 186.4	2 286.9	501.5	1 102.0	2 254.2	2 649.5	2 310.4	2 196.0
Trade-related Adjustment	..	0.0	0.2	1.8	2.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	1.1	2.0	1.7	1.7	0.7
Sub-total	**1 306.1**	**1 495.8**	**2 712.1**	**5 360.7**	**3 242.5**	**4 382.0**	**3 959.8**	**1 194.7**	**2 644.5**	**4 222.8**	**3 966.9**	**4 191.0**	**3 902.8**
Oceania													
Trade Policy & Regulations	3.3	4.5	33.1	15.7	10.9	14.1	37.9	2.4	10.0	19.3	21.0	10.4	13.2
Economic Infrastructure	130.3	219.3	288.0	390.0	703.6	365.2	560.7	137.2	200.7	281.8	359.1	345.1	381.8
Building Productive Capacity	105.9	133.1	156.3	157.8	169.8	133.5	375.1	116.4	112.5	126.5	180.2	134.6	298.3
Trade-related Adjustment	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	..	0.0	0.3	0.0	..	0.0	..
Sub-total	**239.5**	**356.8**	**477.4**	**563.5**	**884.3**	**512.8**	**973.8**	**256.1**	**323.4**	**427.5**	**560.3**	**490.1**	**693.3**
Non-region specific													
Trade Policy & Regulations	135.7	234.9	325.3	297.9	309.9	223.0	186.6	204.7	243.1	289.8	223.2	242.0	230.0
Economic Infrastructure	192.9	244.7	721.7	386.8	403.9	396.1	622.8	170.2	634.2	324.1	206.8	305.9	359.7
Building Productive Capacity	760.9	1 452.2	2 529.3	2 403.7	2 966.1	2 393.9	3 438.0	1 117.3	1 786.5	1 976.4	3 165.0	2 928.5	2 741.3
Trade-related Adjustment	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.3
Sub-total	**1 089.5**	**1 931.8**	**3 576.2**	**3 088.4**	**3 679.9**	**3 013.0**	**4 247.5**	**1 492.2**	**2 663.7**	**2 590.3**	**3 595.1**	**3 476.4**	**3 331.2**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**	**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962134

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.3. Aid for trade by category and income group

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Least developed countries													
Trade Policy & Regulations	83.3	210.0	226.6	334.9	237.6	152.6	486.5	118.4	148.8	244.9	253.1	299.4	162.0
Economic Infrastructure	3 441.8	5 154.4	6 973.5	8 488.9	11 224.6	8 920.3	11 746.6	3 047.1	4 460.3	5 454.8	6 104.0	5 414.2	7 229.3
Building Productive Capacity	2 722.1	3 448.6	4 963.0	5 083.5	6 522.2	5 552.7	6 553.8	2 666.2	3 894.0	3 879.3	4 418.5	4 289.7	4 782.8
Trade-related Adjustment	..	1.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	7.7	24.7	2.0	0.3	1.0	1.1
Sub-total	**6 247.2**	**8 814.5**	**12 165.4**	**13 907.3**	**17 984.4**	**14 627.8**	**18 786.8**	**5 839.4**	**8 527.7**	**9 581.0**	**10 775.9**	**10 004.3**	**12 175.2**
Other low-income countries													
Trade Policy & Regulations	0.2	0.8	2.2	2.6	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.7	2.8	2.6	2.5	0.2
Economic Infrastructure	32.9	6.5	10.7	13.9	1.0	1.3	26.1	6.8	9.5	11.7	5.7	7.1	11.2
Building Productive Capacity	12.5	16.5	85.3	56.2	113.6	53.4	57.6	12.3	60.1	64.9	56.4	57.2	51.0
Trade-related Adjustment	..	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	0.0	1.3	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**45.6**	**23.9**	**98.2**	**72.7**	**115.6**	**54.9**	**83.9**	**19.6**	**71.7**	**79.3**	**64.6**	**66.8**	**62.4**
Lower middle-income countries													
Trade Policy & Regulations	337.7	220.2	249.3	292.9	291.0	330.9	348.3	159.0	214.3	242.3	199.9	345.5	441.5
Economic Infrastructure	4 958.2	7 064.1	10 372.0	15 065.9	16 657.4	15 791.3	14 820.4	4 312.3	6 854.8	9 878.1	11 149.8	10 546.5	11 402.9
Building Productive Capacity	3 654.7	4 660.5	4 928.9	6 293.2	6 711.0	5 185.1	8 034.7	3 152.5	4 161.5	4 794.4	5 548.0	4 636.3	5 673.8
Trade-related Adjustment	..	0.0	2.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	2.8	2.3	0.5	0.5	0.3
Sub-total	**8 950.5**	**11 944.8**	**15 552.3**	**21 653.1**	**23 659.3**	**21 307.2**	**23 203.7**	**7 623.8**	**11 233.3**	**14 917.0**	**16 898.1**	**15 528.7**	**17 518.4**
Upper middle-income countries													
Trade Policy & Regulations	79.4	126.0	115.3	85.9	35.6	21.1	37.4	84.2	83.8	94.6	65.1	38.4	48.0
Economic Infrastructure	3 221.1	3 239.9	2 874.6	4 275.0	4 693.0	5 822.8	4 214.4	3 057.1	2 794.0	3 777.1	3 337.0	3 993.7	3 837.5
Building Productive Capacity	2 545.6	2 264.2	2 285.2	3 670.6	3 280.8	2 673.3	3 020.2	2 179.0	2 271.9	3 295.1	3 384.1	3 187.2	2 760.8
Trade-related Adjustment		0.3	12.8	0.8	0.4	18.6	0.4	0.2	7.2	10.1	11.9	8.3	3.3
Sub-total	**5 846.1**	**5 630.5**	**5 287.9**	**8 032.3**	**8 009.9**	**8 535.9**	**7 272.3**	**5 320.5**	**5 156.9**	**7 176.9**	**6 798.1**	**7 227.7**	**6 649.7**
Non-country specific													
Trade Policy & Regulations	248.2	468.0	718.5	534.1	522.4	467.3	551.9	329.6	526.9	537.8	476.4	461.6	565.2
Economic Infrastructure	451.5	884.8	1 698.7	1 466.0	1 133.2	1 912.0	2 062.8	462.8	1 297.2	1 127.4	763.4	1 204.4	1 380.8
Building Productive Capacity	1 371.3	2 674.7	4 063.5	4 145.7	4 842.1	4 682.1	5 822.1	2 157.3	3 470.5	3 528.8	5 086.8	4 981.5	4 714.5
Trade-related Adjustment		0.1	3.5	0.2	1.8	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.7
Sub-total	**2 071.0**	**4 027.7**	**6 484.2**	**6 146.0**	**6 499.5**	**7 061.9**	**8 437.0**	**2 949.6**	**5 295.0**	**5 194.3**	**6 327.4**	**6 648.2**	**6 661.2**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**	**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962153

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.4. Aid for trade by individual provider *(page 1 of 2)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2015	2017
DAC countries													
Australia	206.6	311.3	494.4	385.6	412.2	394.3	427.8	253.8	391.1	385.6	412.2	394.3	427.8
Austria	45.2	52.7	74.3	86.5	71.1	75.5	75.8	38.7	59.8	58.9	47.5	48.4	64.5
Belgium	229.9	254.6	431.8	184.9	215.6	164.8	217.0	175.8	382.5	204.4	214.5	195.7	192.7
Canada	327.6	359.8	552.5	504.2	722.7	555.6	186.4	272.8	566.2	441.3	347.3	393.8	463.5
Czech Republic		0.0	3.5	7.8	11.2	6.9	9.0	0.0	3.4	7.9	11.2	6.3	8.4
Denmark	413.6	269.5	303.1	371.1	124.6	255.4	203.5	260.4	330.3	335.9	269.1	255.0	232.4
Finland	78.7	126.8	291.8	131.7	91.9	70.2	223.3	61.1	136.4	155.2	155.7	126.7	168.7
France	656.9	1 405.8	1 347.1	2 501.2	2 913.7	2 510.3	3 225.0	839.0	1 092.9	1 746.1	1 504.2	1 928.8	2 470.8
Germany	1 217.6	2 033.4	3 317.0	4 866.1	5 887.8	6 093.6	5 696.6	1 673.2	2 558.5	3 182.4	5 193.9	4 613.7	4 522.4
Greece	11.4	16.7	15.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	15.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hungary		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	3.9	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.4	3.9	2.4
Iceland		0.0	3.3	12.0	8.4	8.7	8.4	0.0	3.3	12.0	8.4	8.7	8.4
Ireland	26.6	42.2	58.4	47.8	33.0	40.2	42.7	42.2	58.4	47.8	33.0	40.2	42.7
Italy	249.7	228.7	164.9	117.4	189.9	77.5	352.6	240.0	142.8	87.2	201.0	98.4	290.3
Japan	4 492.8	5 661.4	6 073.6	8 321.9	12 683.5	11 268.9	12 510.7	4 040.3	4 761.0	5 906.4	6 407.7	6 317.1	8 264.1
Korea		490.3	941.1	877.6	930.8	1 061.0	1 183.7	200.7	373.3	518.5	613.1	590.9	556.5
Luxembourg	16.9	31.4	34.0	38.9	33.9	38.6	55.2	31.4	34.0	38.9	33.9	38.6	55.2
Netherlands	533.3	686.9	698.9	865.0	607.6	511.7	655.0	476.9	474.8	618.5	540.5	616.0	542.3
New Zealand	22.5	45.7	97.9	120.6	145.0	128.6	162.0	31.0	53.6	98.1	114.3	105.6	98.3
Norway	246.3	399.0	502.6	527.1	338.1	348.9	497.4	378.6	383.7	484.0	482.3	404.3	426.9
Poland		0.0	0.0	8.8	31.9	80.5	16.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	31.7	80.3	16.0
Portugal	43.3	28.1	51.0	27.8	25.3	4.2	3.4	35.6	52.5	41.1	23.5	5.1	3.9
Slovak Republic		0.0	0.0	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.8	1.1	0.7
Slovenia		0.0	2.1	1.2	0.1	1.2	1.0	0.0	2.1	0.8	0.6	1.7	1.2
Spain	359.8	658.0	817.1	90.0	52.0	42.9	105.6	460.5	808.2	111.5	69.6	79.7	90.3
Sweden	225.5	326.3	330.5	374.0	292.1	345.6	382.8	328.2	346.2	396.8	337.3	334.8	441.5
Switzerland	295.4	266.1	282.7	374.5	305.1	353.8	695.0	245.9	224.8	295.6	370.4	370.9	331.9
United Kingdom	646.0	806.7	1 107.1	851.3	1 513.7	811.6	1 136.5	827.6	1 177.5	1 293.4	1 960.6	1 815.7	1 918.9
United States	4 278.2	6 094.8	4 696.0	3 469.0	3 487.4	2 975.3	2 416.9	4 403.2	4 332.0	3 550.3	2 922.1	2 748.0	2 406.5
Sub-total	**14 623.8**	**20 596.1**	**22 692.4**	**25 164.6**	**31 130.1**	**28 230.7**	**30 492.4**	**15 333.6**	**18 764.8**	**20 029.9**	**22 306.7**	**21 623.7**	**24 049.3**
Other bilateral													
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.3	..	..	0.1	0.2	1.8	2.3
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8.7	..
Croatia							0.5	..	..	..	..	..	0.5
Estonia	..	..	..	1.5	1.2	2.1	2.0	..	..	1.0	1.4	1.1	1.9
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	0.7	1.8	0.1
Kuwait (KFAED)	..	..	313.7	534.2	399.2	718.9	277.9	..	251.2	269.6	408.7	692.9	373.2
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0	..	0.0	0.0		0.2	0.0
Lithuania	..	..	..	0.0	0.7	0.5	0.5	..	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.5	0.5
Romania				0.1	0.5	1.3		..	0.0	0.3	0.5	1.3	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	481.0	843.4	546.4	..	0.0	0.0	6.8	3.8	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..		0.0	0.0	..	18.5	18.7
Turkey			34.4	..	..	..	..	..	34.4	0.0	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	233.4	891.5	907.3	71.7	437.8	..	88.6	703.9	897.6	429.3	584.3
Sub-total	..	..	581.5	1 427.4	1 789.9	1 638.0	1 267.4	..	374.2	975.1	1 316.5	1 160.0	981.5

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.4. Aid for trade by individual provider *(page 2 of 2)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2015	2017
Multilateral													
AfDB	149.0	706.4	1 498.2	1 578.6	1 824.1	806.7	1 062.6	379.7	1 204.9	1 004.7	1 238.6	1 003.4	1 443.5
Arab Fund (AFESD)		388.3	1 010.3	769.0	1 351.3	962.2	1 031.6	233.6	696.7	670.6	493.0	441.2	528.6
AsDB	747.7	521.1	1 198.4	1 783.8	1 690.1	1 723.7	1 614.7	..	486.7	1 252.0	1 573.2	1 498.7	1 379.9
Caribbean Development Bank		0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	35.5	12.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB		0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8			..	12.6	2.0	1.4	1.4	
Climate Investment Funds		0.0	0.0	783.8	668.7	610.5	570.8	..	..	65.0	210.3	40.2	245.0
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)		0.0	13.1	26.3	18.6	3.6	11.7	..	10.2	16.0	7.6	23.3	15.4
EU Institutions	2 457.6	3 013.4	4 320.7	8 642.2	6 953.8	8 891.2	8 361.0	2 215.3	3 859.8	6 719.9	6 491.9	7 919.1	7 151.6
FAO		131.7	273.6	271.7	316.7			131.7	273.6	271.7	316.7	..	..
GEF		0.0	120.0	274.9	112.6	119.4	624.5	65.7	96.0	125.7	164.6	113.7	65.5
Green Climate Fund		0.0	0.0	0.0	12.8	163.7	186.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
IDB	242.3	110.9	433.2	585.8	797.9	446.9	475.0	0.0	354.9	563.5	521.3	373.9	737.8
IFAD	268.8	375.8	581.0	540.9	927.3	536.8	934.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	15.1	14.2	18.4
IMF		10.2	13.6	9.5				0.0	0.0	0.7			
Islamic Development Bank	190.4	252.3	188.9	138.2	236.7	261.2	149.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC		30.1	54.2	64.9	68.9	57.4	51.4	29.6	51.9	58.0	66.2	54.9	52.8
OFID		0.0	346.8	419.2	515.2	606.4	493.3	0.0	168.2	224.1	297.9	368.8	355.3
UNDP	11.9	24.0	33.5	30.6	26.2	7.0	8.7	23.3	33.4	30.6	26.2	7.0	8.7
UNECE		1.3	4.2	3.5	5.2	5.5	5.7	1.3	4.2	3.5	5.2	5.5	5.7
UNESCAP		0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.8
UNESCWA		0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2
UNIDO		27.0	61.5	12.9	..	82.6	13.5	..	..	..	..	48.6	57.5
World Bank	4 467.9	4 235.5	6 098.7	7 117.1	7 718.2	6 267.1	10 284.3	3 324.1	3 854.7	4 808.6	5 682.2	4 673.4	5 888.0
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	13.2	12.7
WTO		12.7	15.6	11.9	11.7	23.0	12.3	12.7	15.5	11.9	11.7	23.0	12.3
Other multilateral donors	1.0	4.1	47.9	153.9	85.0	107.9	118.2	2.2	21.6	101.3	116.8	67.8	56.2
Sub-total	**8 536.6**	**9 845.2**	**16 314.1**	**23 219.5**	**23 348.8**	**21 719.0**	**26 024.0**	**6 419.4**	**11 145.6**	**15 943.5**	**17 241.0**	**16 692.0**	**18 036.0**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**	**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**
Shares in total Aid for Trade													
DAC countries	*63.1%*	*67.7%*	*57.3%*	*50.5%*	*55.3%*	*54.7%*	*52.8%*	*70.5%*	*62.0%*	*54.2%*	*54.6%*	*54.8%*	*55.8%*
Other bilateral	..	..	*1.5%*	*2.9%*	*3.2%*	*3.2%*	*2.2%*	..	*1.2%*	*2.6%*	*3.2%*	*2.9%*	*2.3%*
Multilateral	*36.9%*	*32.3%*	*41.2%*	*46.6%*	*41.5%*	*42.1%*	*45.0%*	*29.5%*	*36.8%*	*43.2%*	*42.2%*	*42.3%*	*41.9%*

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962172

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.5a. Top 20 providers of aid for trade in 2017, commitments

a	COMMITMENTS						
	2002-05 avg.	**2006-08 avg.**	**2009-11 avg.**	**2012-14 avg.**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Japan	4 492.8	5 661.4	6 073.6	8 321.9	12 683.5	11 268.9	12 510.7
World Bank	4 467.9	4 235.5	6 098.7	7 117.1	7 718.2	6 267.1	10 284.3
EU Institutions	2 457.6	3 013.4	4 320.7	8 642.2	6 953.8	8 891.2	8 361.0
Germany	1 217.6	2 033.4	3 317.0	4 866.1	5 887.8	6 093.6	5 696.6
France	656.9	1 405.8	1 347.1	2 501.2	2 913.7	2 510.3	3 225.0
United States	4 278.2	6 094.8	4 696.0	3 469.0	3 487.4	2 975.3	2 416.9
Asian Development Bank	747.7	521.1	1 198.4	1 783.8	1 690.1	1 723.7	1 614.7
Korea		490.3	941.1	877.6	930.8	1 061.0	1 183.7
United Kingdom	646.0	806.7	1 107.1	851.3	1 513.7	811.6	1 136.5
AfDB	149.0	706.4	1 496.5	1 564.0	1 807.0	794.6	1 052.6
Arab Fund (AFESD)		388.3	1 010.3	769.0	1 351.3	962.2	1 031.6
IFAD	268.8	375.8	581.0	540.9	927.3	536.8	934.0
Switzerland	295.4	266.1	282.7	374.5	305.1	353.8	695.0
Netherlands	533.3	686.9	698.9	865.0	607.6	511.7	655.0
Global Environment Facility	..	..	120.0	274.9	112.6	119.4	624.5
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	783.8	668.7	610.5	570.8
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	481.0	843.4	546.4
Norway	246.3	399.0	502.6	527.1	338.1	348.9	497.4
OPEC Fund for International Development	..	..	346.8	419.2	515.2	606.4	493.3
IDB	242.3	110.9	433.2	585.8	797.9	446.9	475.0
Sub-total	**20 699.8**	**27 195.7**	**34 571.7**	**45 134.2**	**51 690.6**	**47 737.4**	**54 004.9**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**
Top 20 share in total AFT	*89.4%*	*89.3%*	*87.3%*	*90.6%*	*91.9%*	*92.5%*	*93.5%*

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.5b. Top 20 providers of aid for trade in 2017, disbursements

a	DISBURSEMENTS						
	2006-08 avg.	**2009-11 avg.**	**2012-14 avg.**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2015**
Japan	4 040.3	4 761.0	5 906.4	6 407.7	6 317.1	8 264.1	6 269.7
EU Institutions	2 215.3	3 859.8	6 719.9	6 491.9	7 919.1	7 151.6	5 938.4
International Development Association	3 324.1	3 854.7	4 808.6	5 682.2	4 673.4	5 888.0	5 611.0
Germany	1 673.2	2 558.5	3 182.4	5 193.9	4 613.7	4 522.4	4 965.7
France	839.0	1 092.9	1 746.1	1 504.2	1 928.8	2 470.8	2 836.6
United States	4 403.2	4 332.0	3 550.3	2 922.1	2 748.0	2 406.5	2 234.0
United Kingdom	827.6	1 177.5	1 293.4	1 960.6	1 815.7	1 918.9	1 553.4
AfDB	379.7	1 203.7	1 001.1	1 232.0	995.6	1 425.4	1 467.6
AsDB	..	486.7	1 252.0	1 573.2	1 498.7	1 379.9	1 223.1
IDB	..	354.9	563.5	521.3	373.9	737.8	886.4
United Arab Emirates	..	88.6	703.9	897.6	429.3	584.3	587.6
Korea	200.7	373.3	518.5	613.1	590.9	556.5	523.3
Netherlands	476.9	474.8	618.5	540.5	616.0	542.3	514.7
Arab Fund (AFESD)	233.6	696.7	670.6	493.0	441.2	528.6	486.9
Canada	272.8	566.2	441.3	347.3	393.8	463.5	481.7
Sweden	328.2	346.2	396.8	337.3	334.8	441.5	403.6
Australia	253.8	391.1	385.6	412.2	394.3	427.8	386.0
Norway	378.6	383.7	484.0	482.3	404.3	426.9	383.0
Kuwait	..	251.2	269.6	408.7	692.9	373.2	342.7
OPEC Fund for International Development	..	168.2	224.1	297.9	368.8	355.3	329.1
Sub-total	**19 847.0**	**27 421.6**	**34 736.5**	**38 318.9**	**37 550.3**	**40 865.6**	**37 424.3**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**	**39 815.5**
Top 20 share in total AFT	*91.2%*	*90.5%*	*94.0%*	*93.8%*	*95.1%*	*94.9%*	*94.0%*

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962191

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.6. Aid for trade by individual recipient country *(page 1 of 4)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Afghanistan	779.1	1 593.0	1 841.9	1 636.2	1 283.3	896.8	992.1	1 055.6	1 843.2	1 175.5	856.6	818.4	809.6
Albania	129.5	120.7	140.5	57.5	102.4	156.8	118.4	87.9	144.3	113.9	110.0	54.8	34.0
Algeria	93.4	128.7	23.5	21.6	5.9	18.5	22.6	109.0	59.7	32.2	16.1	16.2	17.1
Angola	17.6	79.4	35.7	29.3	217.9	29.1	13.1	32.1	57.0	33.2	227.9	18.3	12.7
Antigua and Barbuda	2.2	0.2	4.6	1.8	12.4	0.2	20.4	0.9	5.1	0.4	0.6	4.9	1.3
Argentina	41.8	24.0	37.2	44.5	10.1	23.9	13.7	32.2	34.3	45.9	12.4	11.4	14.1
Armenia	107.1	229.3	136.9	189.2	251.9	227.2	133.0	101.9	163.9	104.6	204.0	168.2	201.0
Azerbaijan	131.7	92.1	115.9	21.8	24.9	9.7	150.8	80.3	96.0	132.5	23.9	24.7	70.8
Bangladesh	731.3	765.4	1 169.9	1 399.3	2 513.8	2 657.1	2 958.5	357.9	378.8	853.5	945.5	1 055.4	1 884.8
Belarus	0.5	7.5	27.9	8.2	5.2	25.7	18.4	4.0	14.7	12.2	14.1	15.7	22.3
Belize	8.2	8.7	17.5	22.4	40.5	4.7	54.7	5.5	9.3	15.6	11.1	23.1	13.9
Benin	106.4	195.1	209.4	118.4	239.3	146.1	738.5	110.4	212.0	156.6	171.0	150.5	206.2
Bhutan	40.0	39.0	50.9	57.5	135.6	66.0	46.1	26.4	57.5	66.9	59.3	30.8	53.9
Bolivia	240.4	154.0	315.3	297.0	474.8	183.3	994.0	139.9	214.3	239.4	246.2	208.1	376.5
Bosnia and Herzegovina	109.1	154.6	213.7	377.0	74.7	60.2	195.5	88.9	162.5	254.0	144.6	213.8	217.9
Botswana	14.5	5.2	8.9	33.3	2.9	7.6	8.3	10.8	18.8	9.7	5.1	10.6	11.5
Brazil	47.4	62.8	218.1	667.2	786.5	251.1	591.6	73.3	230.2	482.3	685.2	353.4	398.1
Burkina Faso	231.9	184.2	407.4	353.8	310.9	400.7	477.7	187.8	218.3	333.1	305.8	291.2	319.1
Burundi	48.0	81.2	163.0	207.5	143.4	92.3	226.4	71.5	100.8	146.5	91.9	83.6	79.0
Cabo Verde	78.9	61.0	70.5	59.9	45.9	14.9	57.7	59.2	102.3	68.1	54.1	41.9	26.6
Cambodia	177.4	202.3	288.3	416.2	431.0	495.0	525.5	123.0	181.5	265.8	223.4	237.9	339.0
Cameroon	115.8	269.4	285.8	315.4	134.7	190.0	445.1	128.6	136.4	253.5	201.7	215.3	226.7
Central African Republic	32.2	55.5	60.8	47.1	0.3	9.6	51.2	34.8	46.9	30.6	18.9	24.3	11.4
Chad	95.0	38.8	89.8	79.4	120.4	53.5	38.6	48.0	50.7	44.5	89.9	79.2	35.5
Chile	36.1	31.5	58.9	222.3	77.4	157.9	16.7	48.4	75.4	83.4	20.3	173.2	49.5
China (People's Republic of)	714.6	523.7	420.0	318.7	509.3	780.7	281.7	737.9	507.4	361.0	386.1	276.9	300.3
Colombia	89.2	156.4	230.5	226.1	248.2	130.6	252.7	135.5	192.3	159.9	212.6	212.1	162.7
Comoros	3.3	5.8	14.0	25.8	23.3	0.3	39.6	3.4	5.5	11.4	13.9	11.8	22.4
Congo	36.1	34.9	49.4	43.8	89.2	16.5	116.0	26.9	26.5	34.1	28.3	25.3	27.2
Cook Islands	1.5	0.5	10.0	12.0	6.1	4.4	10.9	1.4	4.4	11.0	10.9	0.2	4.4
Costa Rica	46.0	20.2	25.1	63.6	66.6	24.4	252.2	39.1	50.6	12.5	53.4	69.5	53.1
Côte d'Ivoire	55.0	104.1	219.4	132.6	406.1	339.3	752.9	89.8	158.5	115.9	222.2	170.1	212.8
Cuba	8.2	10.4	15.5	15.4	23.6	46.9	152.9	10.7	22.7	16.1	12.7	13.4	25.3
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	36.1	9.2	1.6	9.1	2.5	1.2	4.1	9.2	3.4	2.5	6.1	2.5	8.7
Democratic Republic of the Congo	468.7	280.9	680.1	437.1	401.9	570.7	486.9	192.9	356.4	510.6	467.7	483.0	429.0
Djibouti	20.9	10.2	40.6	62.4	68.5	112.2	71.5	8.3	27.7	23.5	56.2	72.0	46.4
Dominica	12.8	5.9	2.5	19.1	2.1	0.0	17.1	8.5	16.5	11.3	3.9	4.8	10.4
Dominican Republic	39.1	33.2	136.1	53.2	23.9	28.7	34.1	52.3	79.5	74.6	28.8	53.9	27.0
Ecuador	47.9	54.8	62.6	72.7	353.8	66.9	227.4	37.7	58.1	57.6	248.3	114.7	68.5
Egypt	577.1	793.4	951.3	1 640.1	1 558.7	2 528.6	1 069.1	558.6	671.7	1 349.2	883.4	1 125.7	807.5
El Salvador	27.2	212.4	78.6	79.4	171.1	66.5	31.1	48.8	121.7	71.0	20.8	42.3	33.2
Equatorial Guinea	0.8	0.3	0.9	1.3	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.3

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.6. Aid for trade by individual recipient country *(page 2 of 4)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Eritrea	46.5	32.5	25.3	7.2	31.0	24.1	111.4	17.4	16.1	6.1	10.9	11.8	10.2
Eswatini	16.2	20.1	36.8	10.1	58.9	7.7	0.5	11.1	14.1	25.6	27.0	33.9	24.8
Ethiopia	490.8	706.5	662.4	1 228.0	1 409.7	1 355.0	1 081.6	481.4	688.1	693.5	770.8	924.9	917.1
Fiji	7.0	10.8	13.3	26.8	24.3	12.1	15.1	8.3	7.8	11.9	28.4	18.6	30.4
Gabon	36.8	48.7	18.6	23.7	1.6	121.8	3.8	21.6	28.6	32.3	67.2	12.4	8.7
Gambia	32.5	17.3	55.4	81.8	73.5	77.0	120.2	14.5	38.6	40.5	37.2	34.1	80.3
Georgia	101.1	246.2	303.2	313.2	63.5	131.1	306.2	153.0	223.0	299.9	246.8	231.2	199.4
Ghana	257.9	590.6	659.3	392.4	342.0	1 027.0	636.3	318.7	531.8	524.3	474.8	429.3	427.0
Grenada	7.2	1.4	8.8	9.9	10.1	22.9	29.3	0.8	6.0	4.3	12.5	5.0	3.6
Guatemala	27.2	50.0	64.7	123.2	74.5	45.2	32.3	25.3	58.5	80.3	57.2	58.5	47.9
Guinea	66.5	70.0	53.8	128.3	146.5	116.6	160.5	42.6	58.5	66.8	54.4	85.3	120.2
Guinea-Bissau	24.3	14.5	16.3	11.5	116.1	2.6	77.2	31.3	21.9	11.2	10.3	10.5	27.7
Guyana	40.9	51.9	53.0	42.7	3.0	27.6	12.0	16.2	53.4	44.5	4.5	40.1	11.9
Haiti	81.1	90.2	371.5	270.6	367.8	101.7	224.6	53.8	250.2	247.9	255.2	187.3	192.8
Honduras	180.8	66.1	193.1	230.1	346.9	153.7	168.4	73.9	179.1	228.1	146.9	149.1	162.2
India	1 438.3	2 158.2	2 466.4	4 234.1	2 918.7	4 238.1	5 274.9	1 148.4	1 807.9	1 868.8	3 240.5	2 769.2	3 707.8
Indonesia	1 010.0	769.7	780.8	515.4	2 347.7	329.5	2 945.8	736.8	765.0	555.3	922.2	506.3	1 184.4
Iran	4.5	3.1	6.4	2.8	3.9	7.7	13.3	2.0	3.8	5.0	6.3	4.3	4.8
Iraq	2 345.8	2 192.4	421.2	357.3	668.4	8.2	593.3	2 008.8	429.1	447.5	213.9	259.8	364.2
Jamaica	32.1	33.5	43.0	21.8	4.7	24.3	47.5	42.8	47.0	33.2	26.8	18.5	8.0
Jordan	39.7	116.1	179.7	462.1	581.3	301.7	395.3	65.1	213.2	270.9	292.4	315.6	329.1
Kazakhstan	39.3	115.6	84.8	30.1	15.9	5.5	17.5	100.3	58.5	33.8	15.9	34.2	7.8
Kenya	290.6	458.1	1 049.8	1 252.6	1 706.5	934.6	1 213.1	272.6	389.8	912.5	953.3	843.7	932.3
Kiribati	6.9	7.1	35.5	15.2	15.7	63.4	39.8	9.3	7.5	31.1	26.5	31.2	29.3
Kosovo		0.0	82.8	69.1	72.3	60.2	130.1	0.0	53.9	71.2	84.9	68.9	72.1
Kyrgyzstan	51.9	91.7	156.6	186.7	285.3	312.0	172.3	54.5	82.6	129.6	156.2	114.8	129.2
Lao People's Democratic Republic	144.8	119.4	191.1	246.7	257.4	150.3	135.9	112.5	123.0	133.7	211.4	168.7	208.3
Lebanon	26.7	77.9	52.4	59.3	174.1	140.2	50.5	50.0	97.9	87.5	65.7	81.8	96.7
Lesotho	6.3	30.9	27.2	25.2	1.9	25.7	40.8	17.0	23.2	17.1	14.7	10.1	9.7
Liberia	0.9	96.9	192.8	266.0	637.2	141.2	265.9	66.0	96.3	161.3	174.2	278.7	227.6
Libya	2.1	4.7	10.6	11.2	1.8	0.0	7.4	11.3	14.4	2.2	1.5	4.3	7.4
Madagascar	276.8	244.0	47.8	216.9	217.4	277.4	866.8	271.3	126.2	101.8	134.0	155.7	205.6
Malawi	105.9	132.3	226.6	355.3	379.6	225.5	545.6	98.7	149.9	196.1	247.5	279.9	445.6
Malaysia	11.4	41.6	23.0	14.9	15.0	6.4	7.1	127.2	46.2	10.8	9.5	10.3	10.8
Maldives	9.8	14.7	13.7	31.7	110.1	138.5	69.7	3.6	15.4	4.9	7.7	13.7	29.6
Mali	176.2	512.8	382.0	274.7	193.2	351.3	309.0	227.9	348.5	269.6	256.2	272.5	296.7
Marshall Islands	4.9	1.2	6.7	9.8	7.8	11.1	61.4	1.6	5.2	6.5	5.0	1.2	4.0
Mauritania	115.7	138.5	132.1	173.6	177.6	332.4	503.4	74.8	124.2	113.3	103.9	122.6	125.3
Mauritius	48.7	31.0	44.8	89.7	42.8	40.3	9.1	6.1	20.6	66.7	69.5	25.7	26.0
Mexico	24.5	49.0	110.6	312.6	198.3	481.6	330.0	25.5	85.4	227.1	105.8	504.2	375.2

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.6. Aid for trade by individual recipient country *(page 3 of 4)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Micronesia	13.1	16.2	7.3	35.0	9.2	12.0	26.0	9.1	13.3	10.6	13.4	15.7	9.2
Moldova	63.3	43.2	188.1	243.2	77.5	281.9	106.1	39.7	79.2	184.4	165.6	122.5	84.0
Mongolia	55.6	251.7	169.0	94.5	429.5	214.8	155.6	65.4	127.6	199.8	146.9	221.5	276.4
Montenegro	6.4	28.6	24.4	75.2	137.5	48.2	108.1	22.3	35.1	46.1	91.5	67.8	116.1
Montserrat	6.9	10.8	1.4	10.0	22.4	9.1	2.2	4.2	9.1	13.3	17.0	9.1	12.2
Morocco	292.3	831.5	899.7	1 624.8	958.7	1 133.6	1 398.8	401.0	720.8	1 177.9	995.7	1 722.7	1 752.1
Mozambique	321.0	439.9	419.5	599.7	720.0	270.6	603.7	329.4	320.2	500.9	569.5	445.6	486.6
Myanmar	9.9	15.4	32.8	697.3	2 281.2	609.9	1 191.5	15.9	45.5	174.3	328.9	474.6	529.0
Namibia	30.1	72.8	91.6	36.7	92.1	47.8	110.9	28.6	69.9	58.1	53.3	58.6	54.8
Nauru	2.2	10.0	2.6	3.6	14.3	4.5	33.5	9.7	2.9	3.9	8.4	2.5	6.0
Nepal	158.7	195.7	370.0	630.3	331.1	465.1	765.6	121.4	207.4	278.8	400.3	282.3	488.6
Nicaragua	183.2	197.9	215.2	220.4	308.6	364.7	391.3	132.4	203.9	187.2	246.9	199.1	343.9
Niger	108.3	108.2	109.2	268.7	321.9	576.4	424.7	86.8	97.6	133.6	109.0	205.9	283.2
Nigeria	227.3	331.4	560.7	898.6	293.4	249.5	804.3	225.7	322.6	467.2	590.2	406.1	695.4
Niue	2.3	2.0	5.9	3.8	9.8	1.0	15.5	2.2	4.8	3.8	10.0	2.6	4.2
North Macedonia	48.8	45.4	65.7	152.0	95.3	50.0	31.4	31.9	44.8	117.2	144.5	54.5	19.5
Pakistan	564.4	681.7	755.8	1 532.8	1 755.3	1 079.4	884.8	340.1	425.9	1 083.4	1 759.3	900.0	928.3
Palau	6.0	5.8	3.5	6.9	6.0	15.7	5.2	7.5	3.8	6.4	5.5	4.1	9.4
Panama	9.6	12.2	17.4	7.0	6.6	269.1	14.4	7.4	12.4	7.9	3.8	9.4	12.6
Papua New Guinea	121.4	132.3	191.9	196.7	380.7	136.0	220.6	96.3	108.1	159.2	194.8	171.0	155.4
Paraguay	15.2	83.7	84.5	92.6	63.7	140.2	83.4	32.8	43.9	46.4	44.0	75.6	108.3
Peru	129.8	125.0	144.7	173.9	96.2	401.3	193.0	176.6	131.0	125.2	98.8	119.9	253.6
Philippines	313.1	220.2	573.0	630.9	2 846.4	266.0	294.0	462.0	369.5	220.7	366.4	362.0	274.8
Rwanda	71.4	122.1	287.0	310.1	356.2	868.4	468.5	101.7	205.8	198.2	340.5	335.9	527.1
Saint Helena	36.4	13.4	28.4	12.5	24.1	82.1	3.9	13.2	29.8	92.8	42.5	44.6	25.1
Saint Lucia	8.4	7.7	3.5	17.9	12.2	17.2	21.1	6.6	15.3	6.5	4.1	8.7	6.3
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	6.1	6.7	0.7	8.7	0.5	50.1	19.3	8.8	7.3	1.5	1.9	8.0	4.1
Samoa	14.4	25.7	18.0	41.9	65.6	32.4	45.9	8.6	25.6	26.4	32.5	37.6	75.3
Sao Tome and Principe	7.1	6.1	16.1	4.9	31.2	23.3	5.6	6.2	8.2	9.8	16.4	9.1	7.7
Senegal	181.3	232.2	501.3	350.0	617.6	251.4	959.1	208.0	237.7	337.3	427.7	292.0	376.5
Serbia	411.3	276.1	593.4	715.2	559.8	225.5	621.8	230.5	435.6	535.8	420.6	440.8	475.6
Seychelles	2.9	5.2	1.5	4.8	28.2	19.3	6.9	3.0	6.4	11.3	3.0	3.9	9.8
Sierra Leone	92.1	83.6	90.5	122.4	56.2	222.2	154.9	49.7	97.9	92.3	65.9	101.6	98.3
Solomon Islands	11.2	24.0	35.9	55.2	65.5	51.5	121.9	16.6	29.1	38.9	44.2	47.5	57.2
Somalia	4.0	13.3	28.7	67.0	58.8	34.4	28.7	5.7	22.9	49.5	70.8	54.6	50.1
South Africa	118.8	147.5	146.7	228.9	999.7	192.7	225.5	177.9	154.3	197.2	616.6	462.7	211.8
South Sudan		0.0	21.6	165.4	100.9	11.8	119.5	0.0	6.2	87.2	134.6	72.2	97.9
Sri Lanka	451.5	347.8	391.9	597.6	473.1	969.2	484.0	273.8	359.3	390.1	390.2	297.4	262.1
Sudan	27.5	219.1	403.3	257.0	207.1	225.8	211.1	80.5	257.3	182.4	269.7	59.0	121.4
Suriname	21.1	16.3	19.6	4.7	0.4	22.4	0.5	21.2	30.1	13.5	2.1	5.5	8.5

Table A.6. Aid for trade by individual recipient country *(page 4 of 4)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Syrian Arab Republic	15.8	26.6	177.4	1.9	4.6	15.0	13.4	43.2	94.5	14.6	4.6	14.7	14.7
Tajikistan	100.4	120.7	188.3	199.2	260.6	188.5	439.2	47.5	115.2	155.7	230.3	196.1	186.0
Tanzania	374.8	751.8	851.0	960.5	1 133.1	871.9	962.2	381.5	611.0	863.6	863.4	750.1	797.5
Thailand	325.7	222.9	306.3	57.5	354.4	1 498.0	52.2	164.5	151.1	359.9	145.6	377.4	370.6
Timor-Leste	31.0	31.7	54.1	83.8	59.8	144.6	62.6	22.7	37.9	57.0	72.0	75.3	75.9
Togo	8.3	39.8	93.6	61.8	81.9	108.7	189.8	33.9	35.0	46.0	86.5	32.9	77.9
Tokelau	1.6	1.3	3.8	9.0	0.8	0.1	17.6	2.6	2.6	8.8	2.8	0.1	1.7
Tonga	2.7	13.1	34.6	27.9	54.0	12.8	29.4	6.8	17.8	28.0	28.4	34.0	36.5
Tunisia	196.9	257.6	327.7	1 003.4	746.6	336.5	1 072.7	186.4	357.3	503.9	401.8	485.1	702.7
Turkey	407.8	371.8	989.5	2 973.2	1 700.5	2 533.8	1 933.2	353.4	1 199.8	2 528.5	2 344.8	2 699.5	2 299.3
Turkmenistan	2.6	1.9	8.9	6.8	2.0	1.7	1.3	2.1	3.5	5.5	5.6	6.0	5.8
Tuvalu	3.8	5.3	6.1	21.2	14.2	7.9	21.6	4.9	3.5	8.2	26.0	10.3	17.6
Uganda	245.2	373.4	680.4	511.6	830.9	640.8	340.2	370.3	414.4	422.3	437.1	346.0	390.6
Ukraine	79.3	230.3	228.3	588.9	192.3	764.0	250.4	159.4	273.4	251.2	214.0	328.9	243.9
Uruguay	5.6	3.9	9.0	50.5	3.2	6.0	0.9	6.2	13.1	28.8	26.1	3.2	27.8
Uzbekistan	137.8	54.2	201.7	601.1	502.5	323.7	495.4	50.7	70.2	130.6	280.8	267.4	482.3
Vanuatu	6.0	42.2	20.6	38.7	145.8	47.3	50.4	22.2	33.6	18.4	39.5	54.4	66.6
Venezuela	2.3	1.5	1.7	4.4	0.8	0.3	1.3	2.1	1.9	1.4	2.3	2.1	0.7
Viet Nam	1 421.1	1 684.4	2 226.8	2 521.3	2 346.7	3 725.3	1 154.0	1 007.9	1 501.5	2 474.2	2 332.6	2 176.7	1 760.0
Wallis and Futuna	6.6	1.5	3.7	11.7	2.0	7.4	3.8	1.5	5.7	6.9	4.5	7.7	4.1
West Bank and Gaza Strip	61.1	90.7	165.4	107.2	142.8	139.5	121.3	67.8	174.1	95.3	99.3	124.4	217.7
Yemen	57.0	155.7	414.8	200.1	425.5	61.8	516.8	72.3	124.2	144.9	367.6	129.6	276.5
Zambia	201.4	211.2	257.3	330.6	231.3	360.3	440.0	139.4	123.7	195.7	270.9	295.5	203.5
Zimbabwe	9.5	14.6	96.6	63.6	113.0	53.7	79.8	10.5	68.3	76.8	58.5	64.4	53.7
Total recipient countries	**21 089.4**	**26 413.6**	**33 103.7**	**43 665.4**	**49 769.2**	**44 525.8**	**49 346.7**	**18 803.3**	**24 989.5**	**31 754.2**	**34 536.7**	**32 827.5**	**36 405.7**
Non-country specific	2 071.0	4 027.7	6 484.2	6 146.0	6 499.5	7 061.9	8 437.0	2 949.6	5 295.0	5 194.3	6 327.4	6 648.2	6 661.2
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**	**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962210

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.7a. Top 20 recipients of aid for trade in 2017, commitments

	COMMITMENTS								
	Region	**Income group**	**2002-05 avg.**	**2006-08 avg.**	**2009-11 avg.**	**2012-14 avg.**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
India	Asia	LMIC	1 438.3	2 158.2	2 466.4	4 234.1	2 918.7	4 238.1	5 274.9
Bangladesh	Asia	LDC	731.3	765.4	1 169.9	1 399.3	2 513.8	2 657.1	2 958.5
Indonesia	Asia	LMIC	1 010.0	769.7	780.8	515.4	2 347.7	329.5	2 945.8
Turkey	Europe	UMIC	407.8	371.8	989.5	2 973.2	1 700.5	2 533.8	1 933.2
Morocco	Africa	LMIC	292.3	831.5	899.7	1 624.8	958.7	1 133.6	1 398.8
Kenya	Africa	LMIC	290.6	458.1	1 049.8	1 252.6	1 706.5	934.6	1 213.1
Myanmar	Asia	LDC	9.9	15.4	32.8	697.3	2 281.2	609.9	1 191.5
Viet Nam	Africa	LMIC	1 421.1	1 684.4	2 226.8	2 521.3	2 346.7	3 725.3	1 154.0
Ethiopia	Africa	LDC	490.8	706.5	662.4	1 228.0	1 409.7	1 355.0	1 081.6
Tunisia	Africa	LMIC	196.9	257.6	327.7	1 003.4	746.6	336.5	1 072.7
Egypt	Africa	LMIC	577.1	793.4	951.3	1 640.1	1 558.7	2 528.6	1 069.1
Bolivia	America	LMIC	240.4	154.0	315.3	297.0	474.8	183.3	994.0
Afghanistan	Asia	LDC	779.1	1 593.0	1 841.9	1 636.2	1 283.3	896.8	992.1
Tanzania	Africa	LDC	374.8	751.8	851.0	960.5	1 133.1	871.9	962.2
Senegal	Africa	LDC	181.3	232.2	501.3	350.0	617.6	251.4	959.1
Pakistan	Asia	LMIC	564.4	681.7	755.8	1 532.8	1 755.3	1 079.4	884.8
Madagascar	Africa	LDC	276.8	244.0	47.8	216.9	217.4	277.4	866.8
Nigeria	Africa	LMIC	227.3	331.4	560.7	898.6	293.4	249.5	804.3
Nepal	Asia	LDC	158.7	195.7	370.0	630.3	331.1	465.1	765.6
Côte d'Ivoire	Africa	LMIC	55.0	104.1	219.4	132.6	406.1	339.3	752.9
Sub-total			**9 724.0**	**13 099.7**	**17 020.3**	**25 744.7**	**27 000.7**	**24 996.2**	**29 275.1**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE			**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 759.8**
Top 20 share in total AFT			*42.0%*	*43.0%*	*43.0%*	*51.7%*	*48.0%*	*48.5%*	*50.7%*

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.7b. Top 20 recipients of aid for trade in 2017, disbursements

	DISBURSEMENTS								
	Region	**Income group**	**2006-08 avg.**	**2009-11 avg.**	**2012-14 avg.**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2017**
India	Asia	LMIC	1 148.4	1 807.9	1 868.8	3 240.5	2 769.2	3 707.8	5 274.9
Turkey	Europe	UMIC	353.4	1 199.8	2 528.5	2 344.8	2 699.5	2 299.3	2 958.5
Bangladesh	Asia	LDC	357.9	378.8	853.5	945.5	1 055.4	1 884.8	2 945.8
Viet Nam	Asia	LMIC	1 007.9	1 501.5	2 474.2	2 332.6	2 176.7	1 760.0	1 933.2
Morocco	Africa	LMIC	401.0	720.8	1 177.9	995.7	1 722.7	1 752.1	1 398.8
Indonesia	Asia	LMIC	736.8	765.0	555.3	922.2	506.3	1 184.4	1 213.1
Kenya	Africa	LMIC	272.6	389.8	912.5	953.3	843.7	932.3	1 191.5
Pakistan	Asia	LMIC	340.1	425.9	1 083.4	1 759.3	900.0	928.3	1 154.0
Ethiopia	Africa	LDC	481.4	688.1	693.5	770.8	924.9	917.1	1 081.6
Afghanistan	Asia	LDC	1 055.6	1 843.2	1 175.5	856.6	818.4	809.6	1 072.7
Egypt	Africa	LMIC	558.6	671.7	1 349.2	883.4	1 125.7	807.5	1 069.1
Tanzania	Africa	LDC	381.5	611.0	863.6	863.4	750.1	797.5	994.0
Tunisia	Africa	LMIC	186.4	357.3	503.9	401.8	485.1	702.7	992.1
Nigeria	Africa	LMIC	225.7	322.6	467.2	590.2	406.1	695.4	962.2
Myanmar	Asia	LDC	15.9	45.5	174.3	328.9	474.6	529.0	959.1
Rwanda	Africa	LDC	101.7	205.8	198.2	340.5	335.9	527.1	884.8
Nepal	Asia	LDC	121.4	207.4	278.8	400.3	282.3	488.6	866.8
Mozambique	Africa	LDC	329.4	320.2	500.9	569.5	445.6	486.6	804.3
Uzbekistan	Asia	LMIC	50.7	70.2	130.6	280.8	267.4	482.3	765.6
Serbia	Europe	UMIC	230.5	435.6	535.8	420.6	440.8	475.6	752.9
Sub-total			**8 356.8**	**12 968.3**	**18 325.6**	**20 200.5**	**19 430.3**	**22 168.1**	**29 275.1**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE			**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**	**57 759.8**
Top 20 share in total AFT			*38.4%*	*42.8%*	*49.6%*	*49.4%*	*49.2%*	*51.5%*	*50.7%*

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962229

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.8. Aid-for-trade regional and global programmes

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Africa	551.5	1 106.1	1 818.7	1 901.2	1 658.5	2 615.1	2 562.9	661.8	1 649.0	1 536.2	1 679.0	2 138.1	1 796.0
America	179.3	373.6	449.8	492.6	412.2	669.4	515.8	259.5	407.3	494.9	281.3	487.7	491.5
Asia	173.0	340.9	403.9	514.4	461.6	495.5	409.4	312.1	326.4	417.1	460.5	370.9	542.5
Europe	50.1	217.4	157.8	101.1	224.9	175.6	446.3	176.6	201.2	108.2	232.2	123.7	318.0
Oceania	27.7	57.8	77.8	48.3	62.4	93.2	255.1	47.4	47.5	47.5	79.4	51.3	182.1
Non-region specific	1 089.5	1 931.8	3 576.2	3 088.4	3 679.9	3 013.0	4 247.5	1 492.2	2 663.7	2 590.3	3 595.1	3 476.4	3 331.2
TOTAL	**2 071.0**	**4 027.7**	**6 484.2**	**6 146.0**	**6 499.5**	**7 061.9**	**8 437.0**	**2 949.6**	**5 295.0**	**5 194.3**	**6 327.4**	**6 648.2**	**6 661.2**
Share in total													
Africa	*26.6%*	*27.5%*	*28.0%*	*30.9%*	*25.5%*	*37.0%*	*30.4%*	*22.4%*	*31.1%*	*29.6%*	*26.5%*	*32.2%*	*27.0%*
America	*8.7%*	*9.3%*	*6.9%*	*8.0%*	*6.3%*	*9.5%*	*6.1%*	*8.8%*	*7.7%*	*9.5%*	*4.4%*	*7.3%*	*7.4%*
Asia	*8.4%*	*8.5%*	*6.2%*	*8.4%*	*7.1%*	*7.0%*	*4.9%*	*10.6%*	*6.2%*	*8.0%*	*7.3%*	*5.6%*	*8.1%*
Europe	*2.4%*	*5.4%*	*2.4%*	*1.6%*	*3.5%*	*2.5%*	*5.3%*	*6.0%*	*3.8%*	*2.1%*	*3.7%*	*1.9%*	*4.8%*
Oceania	*1.3%*	*1.4%*	*1.2%*	*0.8%*	*1.0%*	*1.3%*	*3.0%*	*1.6%*	*0.9%*	*0.9%*	*1.3%*	*0.8%*	*2.7%*
Non-region specific	*52.6%*	*48.0%*	*55.2%*	*50.2%*	*56.6%*	*42.7%*	*50.3%*	*50.6%*	*50.3%*	*49.9%*	*56.8%*	*52.3%*	*50.0%*

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962248

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.9. Aid for trade regional and global programmes by category

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Trade Policy & Regulations	248.2	468.0	718.5	534.1	522.4	467.3	551.9	329.6	526.9	537.8	476.4	461.6	565.2
Economic Infrastructure	451.5	884.8	1 698.7	1 466.0	1 133.2	1 912.0	2 062.8	462.8	1 297.2	1 127.4	763.4	1 204.4	1 380.8
Building Productive Capacity	1 371.3	2 674.7	4 063.5	4 145.7	4 842.1	4 682.1	5 822.1	2 157.3	3 470.5	3 528.8	5 086.8	4 981.5	4 714.5
Trade-related Adjustment	..	0.1	3.5	0.2	1.8	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.7
TOTAL	**2 071.0**	**4 027.7**	**6 484.2**	**6 146.0**	**6 499.5**	**7 061.9**	**8 437.0**	**2 949.6**	**5 295.0**	**5 194.3**	**6 327.4**	**6 648.2**	**6 661.2**
Share in total													
Trade Policy & Regulations	*12.0%*	*11.6%*	*11.1%*	*8.7%*	*8.0%*	*6.6%*	*6.5%*	*11.2%*	*10.0%*	*10.4%*	*7.5%*	*6.9%*	*8.5%*
Economic Infrastructure	*21.8%*	*22.0%*	*26.2%*	*23.9%*	*17.4%*	*27.1%*	*24.4%*	*15.7%*	*24.5%*	*21.7%*	*12.1%*	*18.1%*	*20.7%*
Building Productive Capacity	*66.2%*	*66.4%*	*62.7%*	*67.5%*	*74.5%*	*66.3%*	*69.0%*	*73.1%*	*65.5%*	*67.9%*	*80.4%*	*74.9%*	*70.8%*
Trade-related Adjustment	..	*0.0%*	*0.1%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*	*0.0%*

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962267

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.10. Aid-for-trade grants and loans by category

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Trade Policy & Regulations													
Grants	671.6	984.3	1 246.6	1 100.5	865.0	667.9	801.7	658.8	910.5	1 008.7	874.2	823.1	903.2
Loans	77.3	40.8	65.2	149.9	222.6	304.2	622.6	32.9	64.0	113.6	122.9	324.3	313.7
Sub-total	**748.8**	**1 025.0**	**1 311.9**	**1 250.5**	**1 087.6**	**972.1**	**1 424.3**	**691.7**	**974.5**	**1 122.3**	**997.0**	**1 147.4**	**1 216.9**
Economic Infrastructure													
Grants	4 917.8	7 276.3	7 350.8	6 840.9	6 137.8	5 991.2	6 270.7	5 181.2	5 942.2	6 121.6	5 718.0	5 826.4	5 354.0
Loans	7 187.6	9 073.4	14 578.8	22 468.8	27 571.4	26 456.5	26 599.7	5 704.8	9 473.5	14 127.5	15 641.9	15 339.5	18 507.7
Sub-total	**12 105.4**	**16 349.7**	**21 929.6**	**29 309.6**	**33 709.2**	**32 447.7**	**32 870.3**	**10 886.1**	**15 415.8**	**20 249.0**	**21 359.9**	**21 165.9**	**23 861.7**
Building Productive Capacity													
Grants	6 129.8	7 869.6	10 061.8	9 631.5	10 106.3	9 189.9	10 853.4	6 698.9	8 775.9	8 509.9	9 696.3	9 627.4	9 494.9
Loans	4 176.3	5 195.0	6 264.1	9 617.7	11 363.4	8 956.7	12 634.9	3 468.5	5 082.0	7 052.7	8 797.5	7 524.5	8 488.0
Sub-total	**10 306.1**	**13 064.6**	**16 325.8**	**19 249.2**	**21 469.7**	**18 146.6**	**23 488.3**	**10 167.4**	**13 857.9**	**15 562.6**	**18 493.7**	**17 151.9**	**17 982.8**
Trade-related Adjustment													
Grants	..	2.0	17.5	2.2	2.3	21.3	0.8	7.8	36.0	14.6	13.5	9.5	4.6
Loans	..	..	3.2	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.8
Sub-total	**..**	**2.0**	**20.7**	**2.2**	**2.3**	**21.3**	**0.8**	**7.8**	**36.4**	**14.6**	**13.5**	**10.5**	**5.4**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**	**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**
Share in total Aid for Trade													
Grants	*50.6%*	*53.0%*	*47.2%*	*35.3%*	*30.4%*	*30.8%*	*31.0%*	*57.7%*	*51.7%*	*42.4%*	*39.9%*	*41.3%*	*36.6%*
Loans	*49.4%*	*47.0%*	*52.8%*	*64.7%*	*69.6%*	*69.2%*	*69.0%*	*42.3%*	*48.3%*	*57.6%*	*60.1%*	*58.7%*	*63.4%*

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962286

USD million (2017 constant)

TABLE A.11. Aid-for-trade channels of delivery

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Public sector institution	1 404.2	21 392.7	27 571.6	33 926.0	41 008.4	38 416.8	44 876.2	10 080.5	19 976.6	23 944.2	28 979.2	28 064.5	31 862.7
NGOs and civil society	95.8	875.0	1 554.2	1 867.4	2 438.6	1 801.2	1 584.6	819.0	1 712.3	1 700.0	2 155.1	1 945.2	1 937.4
Public-private partnerships and networks	0.9	4.8	289.3	185.4	374.6	290.7	360.0	5.7	323.3	207.1	315.1	407.6	364.8
Multilateral organisations	201.8	1 309.6	3 660.8	7 932.1	4 053.7	4 365.0	5 291.6	1 176.6	3 167.5	6 028.1	3 759.7	3 631.0	3 821.3
Other	1 872.0	2 165.1	4 120.2	3 884.0	5 465.9	5 218.7	4 986.5	2 777.2	3 961.1	4 075.8	4 984.2	5 003.2	4 696.1
Channels not reported	19 585.7	4 694.2	2 391.8	2 016.6	2 927.5	1 495.4	684.8	6 894.0	1 143.8	993.3	670.7	424.2	384.6
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**	**21 753.0**	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962305

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.12. Aid for trade by provider and by category, commitments *(page 1 of 6)*

	TOTAL AID FOR TRADE						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries							
Australia	206.6	311.3	494.4	385.6	412.2	394.3	427.8
Austria	45.2	52.7	74.3	86.5	71.1	75.5	75.8
Belgium	229.9	254.6	431.8	184.9	215.6	164.8	217.0
Canada	327.6	359.8	552.5	504.2	722.7	555.6	186.4
Czech Republic	..	..	3.5	7.8	11.2	6.9	9.0
Denmark	413.6	269.5	303.1	371.1	124.6	255.4	203.5
Finland	78.7	126.8	291.8	131.7	91.9	70.2	223.3
France	656.9	1 405.8	1 347.1	2 501.2	2 913.7	2 510.3	3 225.0
Germany	1 217.6	2 033.4	3 317.0	4 866.1	5 887.8	6 093.6	5 696.6
Greece	11.4	16.7	15.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hungary	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	3.9	2.4
Iceland	..	0.0	3.3	12.0	8.4	8.7	8.4
Ireland	26.6	42.2	58.4	47.8	33.0	40.2	42.7
Italy	249.7	228.7	164.9	117.4	189.9	77.5	352.6
Japan	4 492.8	5 661.4	6 073.6	8 321.9	12 683.5	11 268.9	12 510.7
Korea		490.3	941.1	877.6	930.8	1 061.0	1 183.7
Luxembourg	16.9	31.4	34.0	38.9	33.9	38.6	55.2
Netherlands	533.3	686.9	698.9	865.0	607.6	511.7	655.0
New Zealand	22.5	45.7	97.9	120.6	145.0	128.6	162.0
Norway	246.3	399.0	502.6	527.1	338.1	348.9	497.4
Poland		0.0	0.0	8.8	31.9	80.5	16.0
Portugal	43.3	28.1	51.0	27.8	25.3	4.2	3.4
Slovak Republic	..	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.9	0.8	0.8
Slovenia	..	0.0	2.1	1.2	0.1	1.2	1.0
Spain	359.8	658.0	817.1	90.0	52.0	42.9	105.6
Sweden	225.5	326.3	330.5	374.0	292.1	345.6	382.8
Switzerland	295.4	266.1	282.7	374.5	305.1	353.8	695.0
United Kingdom	646.0	806.7	1 107.1	851.3	1 513.7	811.6	1 136.5
United States	4 278.2	6 094.8	4 696.0	3 469.0	3 487.4	2 975.3	2 416.9
Sub-total	**14 623.8**	**20 596.1**	**22 692.4**	**25 164.6**	**31 130.1**	**28 230.7**	**30 492.4**
Other bilateral							
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.3
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.5
Estonia		..	..	1.5	1.2	2.1	2.0
Kazakhstan		..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait		..	313.7	534.2	399.2	718.9	277.9
Latvia		..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0
Lithuania		..	..	0.0	0.7	0.5	0.5
Romania	..	..	..	0.1	0.5	1.3	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	481.0	843.4	546.4
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	..	34.4	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	233.4	891.5	907.3	71.7	437.8
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**581.5**	**1 427.4**	**1 789.9**	**1 638.0**	**1 267.4**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.12. Aid for trade by provider and by category, commitments *(page 2 of 6)*

	TOTAL AID FOR TRADE						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral							
AfDB	149.0	706.4	1 498.2	1 578.6	1 824.1	806.7	1 062.6
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	388.3	1 010.3	769.0	1 351.3	962.2	1 031.6
AsDB	747.7	521.1	1 198.4	1 783.8	1 690.1	1 723.7	1 614.7
BADEA	..	..	..	..	4.1	35.5	12.9
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	2.8	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	783.8	668.7	610.5	570.8
Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	..	..	13.1	26.3	18.6	3.6	11.7
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	2 457.6	3 013.4	4 320.7	8 642.2	6 953.8	8 891.2	8 361.0
EU Institutions	..	131.7	273.6	271.7	316.7	..	..
FAO	..	..	120.0	274.9	112.6	119.4	624.5
GEF	..	..	..	..	12.8	163.7	186.9
IDB	242.3	110.9	433.2	585.8	797.9	446.9	475.0
IFAD	268.8	375.8	581.0	540.9	927.3	536.8	934.0
IMF	..	10.2	13.6	9.5	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	190.4	252.3	188.9	138.2	236.7	261.2	149.7
ITC	..	30.1	54.2	64.9	68.9	57.4	51.4
OFID	..	..	346.8	419.2	515.2	606.4	493.3
UNDP	11.9	24.0	33.5	30.6	26.2	7.0	8.7
UNECE	..	1.3	4.2	3.5	5.2	5.5	5.7
UNESCAP	..	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.8
UNESCWA	..	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2
UNIDO	..	27.0	61.5	12.9	..	82.6	13.5
World Bank	4 467.9	4 235.5	6 098.7	7 117.1	7 718.2	6 267.1	10 284.3
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	12.7	15.6	11.9	11.7	23.0	12.3
Other multilateral donors	1.0	4.1	47.9	153.9	85.0	107.9	118.2
Sub-total	**8 536.6**	**9 845.2**	**16 314.1**	**23 219.5**	**23 348.8**	**21 719.0**	**26 024.0**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**23 160.4**	**30 441.3**	**39 588.0**	**49 811.5**	**56 268.7**	**51 587.7**	**57 783.8**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.12. Aid for trade by provider and by category, commitments *(page 3 of 6)*

	TRADE POLICY AND REGULATIONS							ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries														
Australia	9.6	6.1	28.5	18.6	38.8	31.6	29.2	69.9	144.5	244.5	160.2	182.8	143.4	134.3
Austria	0.1	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	23.8	18.8	26.0	30.3	35.2	26.5	25.9
Belgium	3.9	4.9	10.5	10.7	0.7	0.7	4.5	52.9	74.0	89.2	42.8	35.5	37.4	62.0
Canada	18.6	20.0	30.2	16.7	35.1	24.0	8.6	43.6	73.5	90.7	93.0	39.7	144.5	55.4
Czech Republic		0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	..	1.4	2.4	5.0	1.7	1.9
Denmark	0.4	2.9	11.4	5.1	2.1	6.5	9.0	200.0	109.1	68.7	90.4	7.9	23.9	42.8
Finland	2.4	6.3	11.6	8.1	22.0	12.1	4.3	29.4	19.6	89.2	45.1	12.7	4.7	169.5
France	4.1	2.6	1.2	3.1	10.0	0.0	3.4	330.3	789.9	729.0	2 043.6	2 118.1	1 398.8	2 220.1
Germany	13.7	34.2	33.7	38.4	43.3	82.1	301.0	556.5	873.5	1 733.8	2 448.9	3 129.6	3 768.0	2 961.8
Greece	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.0		..		6.5	6.9	12.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hungary	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	0.0
Iceland	..	0.0	0.0	0.0		..		..	0.0	1.2	4.9	3.9	4.4	4.0
Ireland	0.1	1.0	0.3	1.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	6.8	2.5	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.2
Italy	1.7	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	146.5	114.3	48.6	29.9	61.7	29.2	270.3
Japan	47.8	50.6	49.7	108.1	44.7	43.5	41.7	3 539.8	3 997.6	5 116.1	6 933.9	11 100.0	10 347.3	9 840.3
Korea		7.1	4.4	8.1	9.6	3.8	12.3	..	403.6	818.7	635.0	777.9	904.3	963.5
Luxembourg	0.1	0.4	1.3	0.0		2.3	0.1	1.1	5.6	2.4	6.0	2.7	0.8	11.5
Netherlands	17.2	60.8	137.9	85.7	130.6	59.1	60.4	136.1	169.0	156.3	67.4	53.5	47.3	47.5
New Zealand	1.8	3.2	5.1	3.7	2.5	7.9	7.3	4.4	16.1	46.5	53.6	30.6	25.0	86.3
Norway	8.8	24.7	11.2	13.4	9.8	19.7	10.8	86.5	148.3	194.8	194.9	44.6	69.5	73.6
Poland		0.0	..	..	..	0.0		..	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.1	0.4	0.4
Portugal	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	..	0.8	0.1	35.9	24.7	47.4	25.9	22.1	1.4	0.9
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
Slovenia	..	..	0.4	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	0.5	0.4	-0.1	0.1	0.4
Spain	1.3	4.2	3.3	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.1	219.0	405.1	256.1	6.5	15.0	4.0	29.4
Sweden	16.2	31.9	50.2	36.5	35.0	30.2	26.8	102.7	89.9	65.4	51.6	131.4	86.3	82.5
Switzerland	37.3	17.1	33.5	35.2	15.3	24.8	60.3	40.1	47.0	43.6	63.8	57.4	48.8	49.3
United Kingdom	23.9	55.3	123.6	56.1	28.5	21.8	30.5	264.9	151.8	359.2	344.6	266.0	440.7	232.1
United States	270.7	270.4	200.8	314.4	193.3	164.9	191.8	1 984.2	3 237.6	1 962.0	1 161.2	1 236.2	1 100.5	919.6
Sub-total	**480.3**	**605.9**	**749.3**	**763.4**	**622.1**	**536.7**	**803.0**	**7 880.8**	**10 923.0**	**12 205.6**	**14 537.5**	**19 371.7**	**18 659.3**	**18 285.5**
Other bilateral														
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	2.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.3	..
Estonia	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	0.8	0.3	0.2	1.0	..
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	298.1	477.8	330.9	503.2	257.7	..
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.2	..
Romania	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.1	..	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	481.0	688.6	429.7	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	31.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	..	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	216.8	539.2	575.8	71.3	284.7	..
Sub-total	**..**	**31.8**	**0.0**	**0.1**	**0.1**	**2.3**	**0.0**	**..**	**515.3**	**1 017.7**	**1 388.3**	**1 264.8**	**973.8**	**..**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.12. Aid for trade by provider and by category, commitments *(page 4 of 6)*

	TRADE POLICY AND REGULATIONS							ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral														
AfDB	22.9	..	..	0.1	..	1.5	2.5	61.3	539.0	1 207.1	1 329.8	1 279.6	619.7	940.0
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	288.7	888.1	692.8	1 140.5	589.7	922.0
AsDB	8.4	1.7	8.0	13.6	1.9	57.6	28.0	358.4	291.2	925.8	1 260.5	1 144.8	1 309.3	1 236.7
BADEA	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.4	..	..	..	..	0.4	25.0	2.2
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	704.5	618.7	517.0	462.3
Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	..	..	13.1	7.7	5.5	3.6	7.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	179.7	326.6	316.3	232.5	187.6	97.2	187.8	1 270.8	1 686.1	1 935.6	4 423.3	3 108.6	4 968.1	3 848.3
EU Institutions	..	19.0	40.3	24.9	32.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
FAO	..	..	..	1.2	..	..	..	..	..	61.5	129.3	85.2	..	108.6
GEF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5.1	123.7	89.6
IDB	..	0.6	7.1	7.8	2.2	1.3	1.8	122.3	87.8	299.8	424.1	610.4	241.1	317.9
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12.7	20.9	43.9	26.4	48.2	9.3	2.3
IMF	..	10.2	13.6	9.5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	0.3	0.0	..	1.1	..	115.5	140.1	82.5	73.3	156.0	186.5	26.8
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	253.9	361.3	445.6	435.6	327.9
UNDP	1.5	3.1	2.9	0.8	0.0	..	..	2.1	5.2	8.9	8.8	16.1	7.0	8.7
UNECE	..	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	..	0.9	3.4	1.9	3.6	4.4	4.6
UNESCAP	..	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.8	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
UNIDO	..	3.8	7.4	4.4	..	1.7	1.1	..	1.3	8.2	0.2	..	36.5	1.5
World Bank	56.0	40.1	105.4	172.0	222.6	247.7	376.6	2 280.6	2 362.7	3 451.1	4 210.8	4 245.7	3 396.0	5 252.3
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	12.7	15.6	11.8	11.7	23.0	12.3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Other multilateral donors	..	0.8	0.2	..	..	..	..	1.0	2.8	39.0	107.4	40.6	54.7	59.4
Sub-total	**268.5**	**419.2**	**530.8**	**487.0**	**465.4**	**435.3**	**619.0**	**4 224.7**	**5 426.7**	**9 208.6**	**13 754.4**	**12 949.1**	**12 523.6**	**13 611.1**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**748.8**	**1 056.8**	**1 280.1**	**1 250.5**	**1 087.6**	**974.4**	**1 422.0**	**12 105.4**	**16 865.0**	**22 432.0**	**29 680.3**	**33 585.6**	**32 156.7**	**31 896.6**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.12. Aid for trade by provider and by category, commitments *(page 5 of 6)*

	BUILDING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY							TRADE-RELATED ADJUSTMENT					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries													
Australia	127.0	160.5	221.1	206.9	190.7	219.4	264.4	0.2	0.4	..	..	..	..
Austria	21.4	32.6	48.2	56.2	35.9	49.0	49.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
Belgium	173.1	175.7	332.2	131.3	179.5	126.8	150.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Canada	265.5	266.1	431.6	394.3	647.9	386.7	122.3	0.1	0.0	0.2	..	0.4	0.1
Czech Republic	..	..	2.1	5.3	6.2	5.1	7.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Denmark	213.1	157.5	222.9	275.7	114.6	225.1	151.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Finland	46.9	101.0	187.9	78.6	57.2	53.4	49.5	..	3.2	..	..	..	..
France	322.5	613.3	616.8	454.5	785.7	1 109.2	1 001.5	..	..	0.0	..	2.3	..
Germany	647.5	1 125.7	1 549.5	2 378.9	2 714.9	2 243.6	2 433.5	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	0.2
Greece	4.6	9.3	2.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	0.4	3.9	2.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iceland	..	..	2.2	7.1	4.5	4.3	4.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Ireland	19.7	38.7	56.9	46.5	32.3	39.4	41.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
Italy	101.5	114.0	116.2	87.4	128.1	48.0	82.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Japan	905.1	1 613.2	907.8	1 279.8	1 538.8	878.1	2 628.7	..	0.1	0.1	..	..	0.0
Korea		79.5	118.0	234.4	143.3	153.0	207.9	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
Luxembourg	15.7	25.4	30.3	32.9	31.2	35.6	43.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Netherlands	380.1	457.0	404.7	711.9	423.5	405.3	547.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
New Zealand	16.3	26.4	46.3	63.4	111.9	95.8	68.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Norway	151.0	226.0	296.6	318.8	283.8	259.7	413.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Poland		0.0	0.0	8.2	29.7	80.0	15.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Portugal	7.3	3.4	3.5	1.9	3.2	2.0	2.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Slovak Republic	..	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Slovenia	..	0.0	1.2	0.8	0.2	1.1	0.5	..	..	..	..	..	..
Spain	139.5	248.7	557.7	83.0	37.0	38.7	76.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sweden	106.5	204.5	214.2	284.9	123.9	229.0	273.4	..	0.7	0.9	1.8	..	0.1
Switzerland	218.1	202.0	203.9	274.8	232.0	261.6	585.1	..	1.7	0.6	0.4	18.6	0.3
United Kingdom	357.1	599.5	624.3	450.6	1 219.2	349.0	873.9	..	..	..	..	..	0.0
United States	2 023.4	2 586.8	2 533.2	1 993.4	2 057.9	1 709.9	1 305.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**6 262.8**	**9 066.9**	**9 731.3**	**9 861.8**	**11 134.0**	**9 013.4**	**11 403.0**	**0.3**	**6.1**	**1.8**	**2.3**	**21.2**	**0.8**
Other bilateral													
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Estonia	..	..	0.7	0.9	1.8	1.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	15.6	56.4	68.3	215.7	20.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Latvia	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0	..	..	..	..	..		..
Lithuania	..	..	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..
Romania	..	..	0.1	0.5	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	154.8	116.7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	2.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	16.5	352.3	331.5	0.4	153.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**..**	**34.4**	**409.6**	**401.5**	**373.1**	**291.3**	**..**	**..**	**..**	**..**	**..**	**0.0**	**..**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.12. Aid for trade by provider and by category, commitments *(page 6 of 6)*

	BUILDING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY							TRADE-RELATED ADJUSTMENT					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral													
AfDB	64.7	167.5	291.1	248.7	544.5	185.5	120.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	99.6	122.1	76.2	210.8	372.6	109.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
AsDB	381.0	228.2	264.6	509.7	543.4	356.8	350.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
BADEA	..	..	..	..	3.7	10.5	10.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	2.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	79.2	50.0	93.5	108.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	..	..	..	18.6	13.1	..	4.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	1 007.1	999.0	2 056.1	3 986.4	3 657.6	3 825.9	4 324.9	1.7	12.7	0.1	..	..	..
EU Institutions	..	112.7	233.3	246.8	283.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
FAO	..	..	58.6	144.4	27.3	119.4	515.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	..	..	..	..	7.7	40.0	97.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
IDB	120.1	22.5	126.2	154.0	185.3	204.5	155.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
IFAD	256.1	354.9	537.1	514.5	879.1	527.5	931.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	74.9	112.2	106.1	64.9	80.8	73.5	122.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	..	30.1	54.2	64.9	68.9	57.4	51.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	..	92.9	57.9	69.6	170.9	165.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNDP	8.3	15.7	21.7	21.0	10.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNECE	..	0.1	0.7	1.1	1.5	0.9	0.9	..	..	0.2	..	0.0	..
UNESCAP	..	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..
UNESCWA	..	..	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNIDO	..	21.9	45.9	8.3	..	44.4	10.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
World Bank	2 131.3	1 832.7	2 540.4	2 734.3	3 249.9	2 623.4	4 655.4	..	1.9	..	..	..	..
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	..	..	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Other multilateral donors	..	0.5	8.7	46.5	44.4	53.2	58.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**4 043.3**	**3 997.7**	**6 560.1**	**8 977.8**	**9 934.2**	**8 760.0**	**11 793.9**	**1.7**	**14.6**	**0.3**	**..**	**0.0**	**..**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**10 306.1**	**13 099.0**	**16 701.1**	**19 241.1**	**21 441.3**	**18 064.8**	**23 197.0**	**2.0**	**20.7**	**2.2**	**2.3**	**21.3**	**0.8**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962324

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.13. Aid for trade by provider and by category, disbursements *(page 1 of 6)*

	TOTAL AID FOR TRADE					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries						
Australia	253.8	391.1	385.6	412.2	394.3	427.8
Austria	38.7	59.8	58.9	47.5	48.4	64.5
Belgium	175.8	382.5	204.4	214.5	195.7	192.7
Canada	272.8	566.2	441.3	347.3	393.8	463.5
Czech Republic	..	3.4	7.9	11.2	6.3	8.4
Denmark	260.4	330.3	335.9	269.1	255.0	232.4
Finland	61.1	136.4	155.2	155.7	126.7	168.7
France	839.0	1 092.9	1 746.1	1 504.2	1 928.8	2 470.8
Germany	1 673.2	2 558.5	3 182.4	5 193.9	4 613.7	4 522.4
Greece	16.7	15.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hungary	..	..	2.1	0.4	3.9	2.4
Iceland	..	3.3	12.0	8.4	8.7	8.4
Ireland	42.2	58.4	47.8	33.0	40.2	42.7
Italy	240.0	142.8	87.2	201.0	98.4	290.3
Japan	4 040.3	4 761.0	5 906.4	6 407.7	6 317.1	8 264.1
Korea	200.7	373.3	518.5	613.1	590.9	556.5
Luxembourg	31.4	34.0	38.9	33.9	38.6	55.2
Netherlands	476.9	474.8	618.5	540.5	616.0	542.3
New Zealand	31.0	53.6	98.1	114.3	105.6	98.3
Norway	378.6	383.7	484.0	482.3	404.3	426.9
Poland	..	..	8.8	31.7	80.3	16.0
Portugal	35.6	52.5	41.1	23.5	5.1	3.9
Slovak Republic	..	..	0.5	0.8	1.1	0.7
Slovenia	..	2.1	0.8	0.6	1.7	1.2
Spain	460.5	808.2	111.5	69.6	79.7	90.3
Sweden	328.2	346.2	396.8	337.3	334.8	441.5
Switzerland	245.9	224.8	295.6	370.4	370.9	331.9
United Kingdom	827.6	1 177.5	1 293.4	1 960.6	1 815.7	1 918.9
United States	4 403.2	4 332.0	3 550.3	2 922.1	2 748.0	2 406.5
Sub-total	**15 333.6**	**18 764.8**	**20 029.9**	**22 306.7**	**21 623.7**	**24 049.3**
Other bilateral						
Azerbaijan	..	..	0.1	0.2	1.8	2.3
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	8.7	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	0.5
Estonia	..	..	1.0	1.4	1.1	1.9
Kazakhstan	..	..	0.1	0.7	1.8	0.1
Kuwait	..	251.2	269.6	408.7	692.9	373.2
Latvia	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0
Lithuania	..	..	0.1	0.6	0.5	0.5
Romania	..	..	0.3	0.5	1.3	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	6.8	3.8	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	18.5	18.7
Turkey	..	34.4	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	88.6	703.9	897.6	429.3	584.3
Sub-total	**..**	**374.2**	**975.1**	**1 316.5**	**1 160.0**	**981.5**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.13. Aid for trade by provider and by category, disbursements *(page 2 of 6)*

	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral						
AfDB	1 204.9	1 004.7	1 238.6	1 003.4	1 443.5	1 062.6
Arab Fund (AFESD)	696.7	670.6	493.0	441.2	528.6	1 031.6
AsDB	486.7	1 252.0	1 573.2	1 498.7	1 379.9	1 614.7
BADEA	..	..	..	..	..	12.9
Caribbean Development Bank	12.6	2.0	1.4	1.4	..	..
CEB	..	65.0	210.3	40.2	245.0	570.8
Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	10.2	16.0	7.6	23.3	15.4	11.7
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	3 859.8	6 719.9	6 491.9	7 919.1	7 151.6	8 361.0
EU Institutions	273.6	271.7	316.7	..	..	..
FAO	96.0	125.7	164.6	113.7	65.5	624.5
GEF	..	..	..	..	..	186.9
IDB	354.9	563.5	521.3	373.9	737.8	475.0
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	934.0
IMF	..	0.7	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	149.7
ITC	51.9	58.0	66.2	54.9	52.8	51.4
OFID	168.2	224.1	297.9	368.8	355.3	493.3
UNDP	33.4	30.6	26.2	7.0	8.7	8.7
UNECE	4.2	3.5	5.2	5.5	5.7	5.7
UNESCAP	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.8
UNESCWA	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
UNIDO	..	..	..	48.6	57.5	13.5
World Bank	3 854.7	4 808.6	5 682.2	4 673.4	5 888.0	10 284.3
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	13.2	12.7	..
WTO	15.5	11.9	11.7	23.0	12.3	12.3
Other multilateral donors	21.6	114.3	132.0	82.0	74.7	118.2
Sub-total	**11 145.6**	**15 943.5**	**17 241.0**	**16 692.0**	**18 036.0**	**26 024.0**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**30 284.5**	**36 948.5**	**40 864.2**	**39 475.7**	**43 066.9**	**57 783.8**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.13. Aid for trade by provider and by category, disbursements *(page 3 of 6)*

	TRADE POLICY AND REGULATIONS						ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries												
Australia	5.7	12.0	18.6	38.8	31.6	29.2	105.1	175.2	160.2	182.8	143.4	134.3
Austria	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	9.4	14.9	14.8	18.4	16.5	22.1
Belgium	3.7	9.1	7.1	1.9	6.1	0.5	32.2	82.9	46.3	41.5	31.0	40.6
Canada	14.8	30.2	20.9	18.5	15.9	14.9	46.9	118.1	91.5	41.4	27.1	135.5
Czech Republic	..	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	1.4	2.5	5.0	1.6	1.8
Denmark	0.7	3.3	12.5	4.9	5.7	13.5	128.6	125.7	103.3	44.6	37.3	50.8
Finland	5.3	6.9	7.4	8.6	13.0	4.2	12.9	33.3	46.0	38.5	21.8	95.7
France	2.2	3.5	2.6	4.3	4.3	3.4	335.0	564.0	1 275.5	1 110.4	1 253.0	1 601.5
Germany	24.0	27.9	31.9	37.7	53.2	288.8	620.5	1 228.3	1 357.8	2 413.0	2 393.5	1 986.9
Greece	0.5	0.2	..	..	..	..	6.9	12.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hungary	..	..	..	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	0.0
Iceland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.2	4.9	3.9	4.4	4.0
Ireland	1.0	0.3	1.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	2.5	1.3	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.2
Italy	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	144.7	66.6	30.8	63.6	20.2	162.1
Japan	47.9	49.2	95.1	53.4	69.1	41.5	2 873.5	3 568.8	4 668.6	5 075.1	5 027.5	6 834.6
Korea	9.8	7.1	8.6	7.2	6.4	6.3	137.2	291.6	387.8	458.8	439.0	404.7
Luxembourg	0.4	1.3	..	..	2.3	0.1	5.6	2.4	6.0	2.7	0.8	11.5
Netherlands	43.5	55.1	85.2	64.0	89.4	61.9	114.0	129.0	100.9	49.6	58.6	65.6
New Zealand	2.6	3.2	4.1	4.6	2.4	2.6	8.4	23.0	50.7	39.6	30.3	35.3
Norway	15.8	16.2	11.5	11.6	10.1	9.7	193.0	142.8	195.5	120.7	87.6	71.0
Poland	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	0.6	2.1	0.4	0.3
Portugal	0.1	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	0.1	32.1	48.9	39.2	20.4	3.0	1.2
Slovak Republic	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	..	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2
Slovenia	..	0.4	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.4
Spain	4.0	3.0	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	248.7	340.4	17.2	11.3	11.0	20.4
Sweden	25.7	42.1	42.9	46.9	31.3	41.2	88.4	84.7	91.4	111.9	60.9	101.3
Switzerland	24.1	21.6	38.6	32.4	23.2	29.9	40.4	28.6	47.9	39.9	48.0	44.1
United Kingdom	42.8	109.9	89.4	72.1	60.3	102.4	128.3	371.0	489.6	360.7	486.3	435.4
United States	152.2	205.2	268.4	200.3	117.6	219.5	2 154.6	1 891.0	1 234.5	852.3	762.2	607.6
Sub-total	**428.3**	**607.8**	**746.2**	**608.2**	**543.1**	**870.8**	**7 469.2**	**9 348.6**	**10 464.0**	**11 108.5**	**10 966.0**	**12 869.2**
Other bilateral												
Azerbaijan	..	..	0.1	0.1	1.7	2.1	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	8.7	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.3
Estonia	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.9
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	0.5	1.8	0.1
Kuwait	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	227.5	225.6	384.8	663.9	344.8
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	..	..	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.2
Romania	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	1.1	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.9	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	18.4	18.7
Turkey	..	31.8	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	3.4	..	..	..	..	72.7	268.9	624.9	382.0	359.6
Sub-total	**..**	**31.8**	**3.5**	**0.2**	**1.7**	**2.3**	**..**	**300.5**	**495.1**	**1 011.9**	**1 076.5**	**724.7**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.13. Aid for trade by provider and by category, disbursements *(page 4 of 6)*

	TRADE POLICY AND REGULATIONS						ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral												
AfDB	0.4	0.6	0.1	..	..	0.9	176.9	554.6	803.7	1 063.2	803.1	1 129.8
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	0.3	..	..	..	..	206.3	590.9	560.4	394.0	346.1	454.1
AsDB	..	3.2	4.3	4.0	6.1	18.1	..	335.7	868.2	1 174.4	974.0	853.2
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12.6	2.0	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	62.6	204.9	28.4	174.0
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	10.2	9.6	3.8	12.4	6.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
EU Institutions	196.0	200.7	186.7	188.9	187.2	211.4	1 235.5	1 898.6	3 412.7	2 651.4	3 863.4	3 626.5
FAO	19.0	40.3	24.9	32.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	..	..	..	..	..	..	9.0	17.3	34.9	44.3	30.7	55.4
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IADB	..	5.2	9.3	14.8	3.9	8.1	..	211.5	377.7	402.1	254.0	537.1
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	0.7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	123.0	172.4	222.5	297.3	294.1
UNDP	3.0	2.9	0.8	0.0	..	..	5.1	8.9	8.8	16.1	7.0	8.7
UNECE	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.9	3.4	1.9	3.6	4.4	4.6
UNESCAP	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.8	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
UNESCWA	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
UNIDO	..	..	..	..	8.4	6.5	..	..	..	..	1.9	3.1
World Bank	31.0	55.2	123.7	131.8	360.9	79.2	1 781.9	1 994.8	2 903.4	2 968.8	2 467.0	3 090.2
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	12.7	15.5	11.8	11.7	23.0	12.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
Other multilateral donors	0.8	0.2	..	..	..	..	1.2	15.4	81.1	94.4	46.1	36.8
Sub-total	**263.4**	**334.9**	**372.6**	**388.7**	**602.6**	**343.8**	**3 416.9**	**5 766.7**	**9 289.9**	**9 239.6**	**9 123.4**	**10 267.7**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**691.7**	**974.5**	**1 122.3**	**997.0**	**1 147.4**	**1 216.9**	**10 886.1**	**15 415.8**	**20 249.0**	**21 359.9**	**21 165.9**	**23 861.7**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.13. Aid for trade by provider and by category, disbursements *(page 5 of 6)*

	BUILDING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY						TRADE-RELATED ADJUSTMENT					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries												
Australia	142.9	203.7	206.9	190.7	219.4	264.4	0.2	0.3	..	..	..	..
Austria	28.0	44.8	44.1	29.0	31.8	42.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Belgium	139.8	290.5	151.1	171.2	158.6	151.5	..	..	..	..	..	..
Canada	211.0	417.9	328.8	287.4	350.7	313.0	0.0	0.0	..	..	0.1	0.1
Czech Republic	..	2.0	5.3	6.1	4.7	6.5	..	..	..	..	..	..
Denmark	131.2	201.3	220.1	219.6	212.0	168.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
Finland	42.9	95.9	101.8	108.6	91.9	68.9	..	0.4	..	..	..	..
France	501.8	525.3	468.0	389.5	671.5	865.7	..	..	0.0	..	..	0.3
Germany	1 028.7	1 302.3	1 792.3	2 742.8	2 167.0	2 245.8	..	..	0.5	0.4	..	0.9
Greece	9.3	2.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	2.1	0.4	3.9	2.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iceland	..	2.2	7.1	4.5	4.3	4.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Ireland	38.7	56.9	46.5	32.3	39.4	41.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
Italy	95.0	76.0	56.4	137.3	78.0	128.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Japan	1 118.9	1 142.9	1 142.5	1 279.2	1 220.5	1 388.0	..	0.1	0.1	..	..	0.0
Korea	53.7	74.6	122.1	147.1	145.4	145.6	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
Luxembourg	25.4	30.3	32.9	31.2	35.6	43.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Netherlands	319.5	290.7	432.4	426.8	468.0	414.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
New Zealand	20.1	27.4	43.3	70.2	72.8	60.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Norway	169.8	224.8	277.0	349.9	306.6	346.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
Poland	..	..	8.3	29.6	79.8	15.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Portugal	3.4	3.5	1.9	3.1	2.1	2.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Slovak Republic	..	..	0.4	0.7	0.8	0.5	..	..	..	..	..	..
Slovenia	..	1.2	0.4	0.5	1.5	0.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Spain	207.7	464.9	94.0	58.1	68.6	69.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sweden	214.1	219.4	262.3	177.7	242.0	298.6	..	0.0	0.2	0.8	0.6	0.4
Switzerland	181.3	173.7	209.0	297.9	292.1	255.2	..	0.9	0.0	0.2	7.5	2.7
United Kingdom	656.5	696.6	714.4	1 527.7	1 269.1	1 381.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.0
United States	2 096.4	2 235.7	2 047.4	1 869.5	1 868.2	1 579.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**7 435.9**	**8 806.7**	**8 818.8**	**10 588.7**	**10 106.4**	**10 304.8**	**0.2**	**1.7**	**0.9**	**1.4**	**8.2**	**4.4**
Other bilateral												
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
Estonia	..	..	0.5	1.0	0.9	1.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	0.2	0.1	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	23.7	44.0	23.9	29.0	28.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
Latvia	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	..	0.0	..
Romania	..	..	0.3	0.5	0.2	..	..	..	..	..		..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	5.9	3.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	2.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	16.0	431.7	272.7	47.4	224.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**..**	**41.9**	**476.5**	**304.4**	**81.8**	**254.5**	**..**	**..**	**..**	**..**	**0.0**	**..**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.13. Aid for trade by provider and by category, disbursements *(page 6 of 6)*

	BUILDING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY						TRADE-RELATED ADJUSTMENT					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral												
AfDB	202.3	649.6	200.9	175.5	200.3	312.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arab Fund (AFESD)	27.3	105.5	110.3	99.0	95.2	74.5	..	..	..	..	..	..
AsDB	..	147.7	379.5	394.8	518.5	508.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	1.4	1.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	2.3	5.5	11.8	71.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	..	6.4	3.9	10.9	9.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
EU Institutions	776.1	1 726.2	3 108.5	3 639.5	3 867.2	3 313.5	7.6	34.2	12.0	12.1	1.3	0.2
FAO	112.7	233.3	246.8	283.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	56.8	78.8	90.9	120.3	83.0	10.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IADB	..	138.1	176.5	104.3	116.0	192.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	29.6	51.9	58.0	66.2	54.9	52.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	45.2	51.6	75.5	71.5	61.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNDP	15.2	21.6	21.0	10.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNECE	0.1	0.7	1.1	1.5	0.9	0.9	..	..	0.2	..	0.0	..
UNESCAP	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..
UNESCWA	..	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNIDO	..	..	..	..	38.4	47.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
World Bank	1 511.1	1 804.3	1 780.2	2 581.7	1 844.5	2 717.8	..	0.4	1.4	..	1.0	0.8
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	13.2	12.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	..	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Other multilateral donors	0.2	6.1	33.1	37.5	36.0	37.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**2 731.5**	**5 009.4**	**6 267.4**	**7 600.6**	**6 963.7**	**7 423.5**	**7.6**	**34.7**	**13.7**	**12.1**	**2.3**	**1.0**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**10 167.4**	**13 857.9**	**15 562.6**	**18 493.7**	**17 151.9**	**17 982.8**	**7.8**	**36.4**	**14.6**	**13.5**	**10.5**	**5.4**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962343

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.14. Aid for trade by provider and by region, commitments *(page 1 of 6)*

	AFRICA							AMERICA						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries														
Australia	10.2	0.6	22.5	33.0	12.3	6.8	10.4	0.2	0.2	3.1	3.9	0.2	0.6	0.6
Austria	9.1	14.8	18.5	31.9	24.5	27.2	15.7	4.6	5.4	6.8	6.0	2.6	6.7	2.1
Belgium	111.5	163.2	225.9	116.6	148.0	98.4	146.6	44.1	33.4	45.3	14.2	14.3	14.3	16.7
Canada	137.1	115.1	243.8	232.6	349.3	394.4	44.6	62.4	89.7	107.4	140.0	163.8	54.7	37.7
Czech Republic	..	..	0.7	1.1	1.3	1.5	2.2	..	..	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Denmark	234.8	165.6	217.7	218.5	92.2	68.6	86.1	38.3	5.4	15.9	16.1	1.7	2.4	6.1
Finland	21.0	47.5	154.2	53.5	62.6	44.5	40.1	11.1	9.1	28.6	15.6	0.7	0.7	10.2
France	375.6	793.0	732.2	1 282.6	1 393.4	1 262.1	1 513.3	28.9	54.1	177.2	430.2	218.0	435.4	410.5
Germany	375.9	421.7	741.9	1 469.1	1 903.8	1 576.5	1 763.6	86.1	257.6	357.6	760.5	702.6	1 017.4	668.8
Greece	0.7	1.0	0.8	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.7	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iceland	..	..	1.6	5.5	3.1	2.8	2.2	..	..	0.3	0.5	..	..	..
Ireland	21.6	29.0	43.4	35.6	28.5	30.7	30.4	0.6	2.8	4.0	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.1
Italy	136.4	94.9	22.7	67.0	87.1	28.9	81.7	37.6	11.9	19.8	6.3	24.7	10.4	18.4
Japan	320.7	882.4	946.1	1 075.5	1 829.6	2 223.4	1 594.8	97.3	211.6	167.9	359.0	226.0	322.1	899.9
Korea	..	74.4	232.0	195.1	140.6	186.0	332.0	..	15.5	89.0	63.8	55.3	201.8	72.0
Luxembourg	7.7	16.9	12.0	16.7	10.8	13.2	28.4	1.8	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.7	2.4	2.3
Netherlands	81.2	104.7	106.3	216.5	310.7	93.0	204.5	39.9	38.3	24.6	4.7	0.7	..	0.1
New Zealand	0.2	0.1	0.8	6.3	1.4	7.9	8.8	0.5	1.5	0.5	3.0	7.3	4.2	..
Norway	116.7	169.2	269.4	296.9	75.8	75.7	130.6	18.6	17.8	35.4	25.8	5.3	11.6	6.1
Poland	..	..	..	6.8	27.5	76.5	12.8	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Portugal	24.0	25.8	49.3	25.9	24.2	2.9	2.4	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.2
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.3	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
Slovenia	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
Spain	106.3	297.7	354.5	29.0	10.0	16.3	21.1	90.2	114.1	196.1	51.6	39.6	22.8	80.7
Sweden	84.8	140.9	127.8	105.5	144.6	118.4	189.9	13.3	8.4	14.3	15.8	11.2	7.4	5.1
Switzerland	70.5	65.4	57.4	141.2	113.1	93.6	136.7	45.8	38.8	39.9	32.7	35.8	58.5	48.9
United Kingdom	206.9	257.0	499.2	343.4	377.6	387.0	173.3	60.8	17.5	58.1	73.8	99.5	126.9	149.8
United States	598.3	1 542.5	1 271.6	966.1	1 212.4	1 418.2	1 126.8	303.2	548.8	440.7	311.2	479.8	204.0	206.3
Sub-total	**3 051.3**	**5 423.5**	**6 352.3**	**6 972.0**	**8 385.1**	**8 255.7**	**7 699.3**	**985.4**	**1 485.4**	**1 836.4**	**2 340.3**	**2 094.7**	**2 506.5**	**2 643.8**
Other bilateral														
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Estonia	..	..	..	0.1	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	..	204.7	393.1	262.4	546.5	236.8	..	..	3.0	0.6	25.3	30.8	13.2
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Romania	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	204.6	773.8	293.7	..	..	..	..	..	..	26.7
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	..	0.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	78.3	595.1	387.7	40.7	321.9	..	..	..	..	15.2	30.5	59.0
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**283.4**	**988.3**	**854.7**	**1 361.2**	**852.4**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**3.0**	**0.6**	**40.5**	**61.4**	**98.9**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.14. Aid for trade by provider and by region, commitments *(page 2 of 6)*

	AFRICA							AMERICA						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral														
AfDB	149.0	706.4	1 498.2	1 578.6	1 824.1	806.7	1 062.6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	276.9	693.8	641.7	959.5	960.6	931.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
AsDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4.1	35.5	12.9
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	83.4	107.4	96.8	219.9	..	..	..	117.5	144.5	28.0	159.5
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	..	10.1	17.2	13.1	2.8	6.9	..	..	0.1	0.3	..	..	0.3
EU Institutions	1 541.8	1 743.1	1 557.0	2 973.7	2 226.3	3 580.9	3 377.1	236.9	245.3	410.0	615.1	826.8	449.6	711.3
FAO	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	..	..	30.3	81.0	21.4	46.4	282.0	..	..	18.3	46.0	6.2	27.3	118.0
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	12.8	89.2	73.3	..	..	..	..	..	1.7	2.1
IADB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	242.3	110.9	433.2	585.8	797.9	446.9	475.0
IFAD	139.7	189.8	352.7	279.0	545.8	317.7	470.4	12.0	17.9	17.2	15.9	18.1	23.5	47.4
IMF	..	4.0	6.3	4.0	..	..	..	..	1.9	1.9	2.1	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	140.5	144.3	105.7	98.9	69.6	134.5	146.6	..	..	..	0.0	..	0.0	0.1
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	..	155.0	199.3	296.6	184.0	179.2	..	..	109.8	45.6	170.3	175.2	229.4
UNDP	4.6	12.7	15.6	16.2	16.0	4.8	3.9	0.2	0.7	0.7	1.4	2.0	0.2	0.2
UNECE	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCAP	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNIDO	..	15.5	23.6	6.5	..	25.8	8.1	..	2.0	4.0	0.4	..	6.3	0.1
World Bank	2 070.6	2 333.9	3 559.4	3 880.8	3 602.0	2 856.8	6 366.6	130.8	89.3	151.7	96.2	92.7	22.8	214.6
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	4.5	4.2	2.0	1.7	3.7	1.4	..	2.5	1.7	0.9	1.4	3.2	1.9
Other multilateral donors	0.6	3.5	35.4	118.4	31.9	59.3	61.1	0.1	0.1	6.7	10.3	24.0	3.5	30.7
Sub-total	**4 046.8**	**5 434.7**	**8 047.4**	**9 980.9**	**9 728.3**	**9 169.9**	**13 190.1**	**622.3**	**470.6**	**1 155.3**	**1 537.5**	**2 088.0**	**1 223.8**	**2 003.5**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**7 098.2**	**10 858.3**	**14 683.1**	**17 941.2**	**18 968.1**	**18 786.8**	**21 741.9**	**1 607.8**	**1 956.0**	**2 994.6**	**3 878.4**	**4 223.1**	**3 791.7**	**4 746.2**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.14. Aid for trade by provider and by region, commitments *(page 3 of 6)*

	ASIA							EUROPE						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries														
Australia	96.4	155.8	285.7	196.2	213.6	188.7	227.0	..	0.0	..	..	..	0.3	0.3
Austria	27.3	16.2	15.8	32.9	17.2	21.8	16.2	3.1	11.7	15.8	3.6	10.2	9.3	34.4
Belgium	30.3	18.7	32.4	12.5	5.3	5.1	4.6	1.7	2.6	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.5
Canada	114.7	118.4	88.0	103.3	185.2	86.0	91.1	1.2	9.5	12.1	17.8	13.3	16.6	6.8
Czech Republic	..	..	1.6	3.6	5.1	2.5	2.9	..	..	1.1	2.8	4.7	2.8	3.7
Denmark	115.5	84.6	44.8	104.4	10.6	81.9	73.1	0.2	0.9	17.9	11.8	10.6	..	0.0
Finland	33.0	38.2	55.3	25.2	5.6	14.9	20.6	2.5	2.5	5.3	1.4	0.6	0.1	7.6
France	164.8	337.2	201.3	546.5	1 147.5	328.7	679.1	20.0	124.1	25.7	41.0	14.8	342.1	45.4
Germany	583.6	944.9	1 186.4	1 725.6	2 093.9	2 235.1	2 085.1	99.9	270.8	394.1	547.7	596.1	537.6	543.2
Greece	2.9	4.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.8	10.8	13.3	0.0	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	0.4	3.1	2.2	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.2
Iceland	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.0	..
Ireland	2.1	7.8	5.6	3.1	1.0	1.3	2.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	..	..	..	..
Italy	29.1	64.6	103.3	29.2	39.7	27.5	237.1	43.2	56.6	18.9	11.7	2.3	1.8	2.9
Japan	3 697.3	4 399.6	4 601.1	6 557.6	10 112.1	8 543.4	9 699.5	293.3	14.6	261.3	141.3	8.8	10.2	4.3
Korea	..	391.7	613.7	606.7	713.5	663.7	740.0	..	3.9	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.6	0.9
Luxembourg	3.2	4.6	6.2	4.7	5.5	2.6	5.4	3.4	2.6	3.1	1.8	0.2	0.2	2.1
Netherlands	102.1	70.7	48.8	30.3	9.2	41.0	69.5	16.7	14.3	1.5	..	..	0.0	0.0
New Zealand	7.5	9.5	21.1	22.3	49.3	31.8	18.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Norway	60.7	102.8	73.5	75.2	21.9	19.6	28.1	20.3	19.5	15.4	11.6	8.7	3.8	8.0
Poland	..	..	..	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.8	..	..	..	1.2	3.4	2.8	2.2
Portugal	2.7	1.6	0.9	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.2	15.0	..	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	..	..	..	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.0
Slovenia	..	..	0.1	0.0	..	0.0	0.1	..	..	1.8	0.9	0.1	0.9	0.8
Spain	94.5	96.1	74.9	7.5	1.6	2.7	1.1	60.8	137.5	56.2	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.5
Sweden	56.7	48.5	32.7	46.1	12.9	90.5	61.4	26.7	24.3	28.4	18.1	29.1	22.8	9.4
Switzerland	102.3	83.0	78.3	107.1	82.4	124.6	186.4	27.4	24.9	25.3	25.8	29.6	10.9	41.5
United Kingdom	274.5	333.8	384.1	237.8	202.3	92.1	170.5	5.8	5.3	1.6	1.2	0.8	1.5	0.9
United States	3 051.2	3 651.1	2 482.8	1 719.6	1 343.5	920.7	622.1	154.8	148.2	254.7	85.0	77.4	89.1	168.7
Sub-total	**8 652.4**	**10 983.9**	**10 439.6**	**12 198.4**	**16 279.9**	**13 530.5**	**15 044.7**	**804.0**	**885.0**	**1 155.0**	**927.1**	**812.0**	**1 054.5**	**884.4**
Other bilateral														
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.5
Estonia	..	..	..	0.7	0.6	0.9	0.4	..	..	..	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.0
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	..	105.6	129.5	110.5	101.1	27.2	..	..	0.4	11.0	..	40.4	0.7
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0
Lithuania	..	..	..	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.3	..	..	..	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.1
Romania	..	..	..	..	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	..	0.1	0.4	1.2	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	276.4	69.6	196.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	30.0
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	..	33.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.9	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	137.2	249.4	433.0	0.4	51.1	..	..	15.0	29.5	50.6	..	..
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**275.8**	**379.6**	**820.8**	**172.2**	**275.0**	**..**	**..**	**16.3**	**41.1**	**52.0**	**43.0**	**32.3**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.14. Aid for trade by provider and by region, commitments *(page 4 of 6)*

	ASIA							EUROPE						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral														
AfDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	111.4	311.0	126.0	391.8	..	100.6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
AsDB	723.8	502.6	1 097.5	1 720.5	1 636.8	1 606.8	1 510.3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.8	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	423.5	175.6	448.4	175.4	..	..	..	143.1	85.4	..	9.3
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	..	2.5	6.5	1.8	0.7	3.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
EU Institutions	253.4	275.6	305.8	603.5	1 409.0	1 418.2	898.4	259.2	508.3	1 472.7	4 132.4	2 227.3	3 175.7	2 899.3
FAO	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	..	..	43.4	105.1	53.8	42.3	111.2	..	..	5.3	17.6	3.9	3.3	19.2
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	..	20.9	53.6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IADB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IFAD	107.2	153.8	196.9	235.2	358.8	176.9	347.7	9.9	14.3	9.4	3.4	..	18.7	48.1
IMF	..	3.0	3.3	2.6	..	..	..	..	1.0	1.4	0.6	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	44.3	90.4	71.5	35.6	165.3	123.1	0.5	2.8	9.5	4.9	0.1	..	..	0.0
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	..	66.3	140.4	47.1	218.7	83.1	..	..	11.3	32.8	..	27.4	..
UNDP	6.5	9.8	12.9	9.1	6.9	1.7	4.3	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.3
UNECE	..	0.0	0.1	0.2	..	0.0	0.3	..	1.3	4.1	3.3	5.2	5.5	5.2
UNESCAP	..	0.1	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	0.0	..	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNIDO	..	5.6	22.5	4.1	..	24.4	2.9	..	0.5	1.5	0.2	..	11.0	0.8
World Bank	2 031.5	1 704.9	2 287.3	2 974.5	3 905.0	3 282.1	3 494.6	229.9	75.1	29.4	57.8	52.7	41.5	60.2
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	1.4	2.0	1.6	2.2	3.6	2.4	..	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other multilateral donors	0.2	0.1	5.6	12.0	15.1	30.1	5.8	..	..	0.0	0.3	0.6	1.2	0.6
Sub-total	**3 167.0**	**2 858.7**	**4 429.1**	**6 401.3**	**8 170.1**	**7 398.6**	**6 794.9**	**502.1**	**610.8**	**1 540.7**	**4 392.4**	**2 378.5**	**3 284.5**	**3 043.1**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**11 819.4**	**13 842.6**	**15 144.6**	**18 979.3**	**25 270.8**	**21 101.3**	**22 114.6**	**1 306.1**	**1 495.8**	**2 712.1**	**5 360.7**	**3 242.5**	**4 382.0**	**3 959.8**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.14. Aid for trade by provider and by region, commitments *(page 5 of 6)*

	OCEANIA							NON-REGION SPECIFIC						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries														
Australia	95.5	108.4	102.0	105.2	150.0	128.7	157.6	4.2	46.3	81.1	47.3	36.1	69.2	32.0
Austria	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1	..	0.7	..	1.2	4.6	17.3	11.9	16.7	9.9	7.4
Belgium	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	42.3	36.7	127.2	41.7	48.0	46.6	48.5
Canada	0.2	0.0	1.3	0.1	0.2	0.4	3.8	12.1	27.0	99.9	10.3	10.9	3.5	2.5
Czech Republic	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Denmark	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	24.8	13.1	6.8	20.4	9.5	102.5	38.3
Finland	..	0.0	0.0	0.1	..	..	..	11.0	29.4	48.4	35.9	22.3	10.0	144.8
France	11.4	3.1	6.3	6.8	3.6	7.6	4.0	56.2	94.3	204.3	194.2	136.3	134.3	572.7
Germany	1.6	0.6	2.6	1.7	18.0	0.6	11.3	70.4	137.7	634.5	361.4	573.3	726.6	624.5
Greece	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	0.2	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..
Iceland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.5	6.0	5.3	5.8	6.2
Ireland	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.0	2.4	5.5	7.2	1.8	6.5	9.1
Italy	..	..	..	0.5	0.7	..	1.1	3.4	0.5	0.2	2.7	35.6	8.9	11.4
Japan	39.9	105.6	46.8	101.0	426.5	67.1	213.6	44.2	47.6	50.4	87.5	80.5	102.8	98.5
Korea	..	1.1	2.1	2.1	3.6	2.0	33.4	..	3.6	3.7	9.2	17.1	6.9	5.4
Luxembourg	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	0.8	3.6	8.8	12.2	13.7	20.2	16.8
Netherlands	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	293.5	458.8	517.8	613.5	287.0	377.6	380.8
New Zealand	13.7	33.7	74.3	87.7	86.9	83.3	134.1	0.6	0.9	1.1	1.3	..	1.5	0.7
Norway	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	30.0	89.6	108.9	117.6	226.3	238.1	324.6
Poland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.2
Portugal	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.4	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.7	0.6	0.6
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.2
Slovenia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.3	..	0.3	0.1
Spain	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	8.0	12.6	135.4	0.7	0.8	1.1	2.2
Sweden	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	43.9	104.2	127.3	188.4	94.3	106.5	117.1
Switzerland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	49.4	54.0	81.8	67.8	44.2	66.1	281.6
United Kingdom	7.1	0.7	0.7	0.0	..	..	0.1	90.8	192.4	163.4	195.1	833.5	204.0	641.9
United States	4.9	29.2	14.6	1.5	3.5	..	2.4	165.9	174.9	231.6	385.6	370.8	343.4	290.6
Sub-total	**174.5**	**282.7**	**251.1**	**306.9**	**693.1**	**290.4**	**561.5**	**956.2**	**1 535.5**	**2 658.1**	**2 419.8**	**2 865.3**	**2 593.2**	**3 658.7**
Other bilateral														
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.3
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Estonia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	..	0.2	0.6
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	1.0	..	..
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	0.1
Romania	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	1.5	15.1	20.8	..	5.8	..	..	1.3	2.4	..	..	..
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**1.6**	**15.1**	**20.8**	**..**	**5.8**	**..**	**..**	**1.3**	**2.6**	**1.1**	**0.2**	**2.9**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.14. Aid for trade by provider and by region, commitments *(page 6 of 6)*

	OCEANIA							NON-REGION SPECIFIC						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral														
AfDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	5.5	1.3	..	1.7	..
AsDB	23.9	18.5	100.9	63.3	53.4	116.9	104.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	4.6	9.0	6.8	6.8	..	..	..	11.7	146.8	30.5	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	..	0.4	2.3	3.7	..	1.5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
EU Institutions	35.7	22.6	40.0	49.2	23.0	16.9	62.0	130.6	218.4	535.1	268.3	241.5	250.1	412.8
FAO	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	131.7	273.6	271.7	316.7	..	..
GEF	..	..	3.3	6.3	10.1	..	16.1	..	..	19.4	18.8	17.3	..	78.0
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	..	17.3	42.9	..	..	..	..	..	34.6	15.0
IADB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IFAD	..	..	4.8	7.4	4.6	..	20.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	0.2	0.6	0.2	..	..	..	..	0.2	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.8	8.1	6.8	3.6	1.8	3.6	2.6
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	30.1	54.2	64.9	68.9	57.4	51.4
OFID	..	..	3.6	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.8	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.6
UNDP	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	..	..	..	3.6	3.1	0.4	..	..
UNECE	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.2
UNESCAP	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.2	0.1	..	..	..
UNIDO	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	3.4	10.0	1.7	..	15.1	1.7
World Bank	5.1	32.3	70.9	107.8	65.8	63.8	148.3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	..	3.5	7.4	7.2	6.3	12.5	6.5
Other multilateral donors	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.8	0.8	3.9	..	0.5	0.1	12.6	12.6	12.9	16.1
Sub-total	**64.9**	**74.1**	**224.7**	**241.5**	**170.4**	**222.5**	**406.5**	**133.3**	**396.3**	**916.8**	**666.0**	**813.5**	**419.7**	**585.9**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**239.5**	**356.8**	**477.4**	**563.5**	**884.3**	**512.8**	**973.8**	**1 089.5**	**1 931.8**	**3 576.2**	**3 088.4**	**3 679.9**	**3 013.0**	**4 247.5**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962362

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.15. Aid for trade by provider and by region, disbursements *(page 1 of 6)*

	AFRICA						AMERICA					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries												
Australia	10.2	0.6	22.5	33.0	12.3	10.4	0.2	3.1	3.9	0.2	0.6	0.6
Austria	9.1	14.8	18.5	31.9	24.5	15.7	5.1	6.9	3.7	2.4	2.9	3.2
Belgium	111.5	163.2	225.9	116.6	148.0	146.6	28.0	50.1	25.3	21.3	17.7	17.5
Canada	137.1	115.1	243.8	232.6	349.3	44.6	51.1	103.2	126.5	93.7	97.7	82.0
Czech Republic	..	..	0.7	1.1	1.3	2.2	..	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Denmark	234.8	165.6	217.7	218.5	92.2	86.1	26.9	22.4	12.2	14.3	11.0	39.2
Finland	21.0	47.5	154.2	53.5	62.6	40.1	7.0	18.1	15.5	10.0	5.3	12.4
France	375.6	793.0	732.2	1 282.6	1 393.4	1 513.3	54.8	113.0	390.7	227.0	418.4	175.4
Germany	375.9	421.7	741.9	1 469.1	1 903.8	1 763.6	187.6	361.7	592.3	499.1	801.6	510.0
Greece	0.7	1.0	0.8	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iceland	..	..	1.6	5.5	3.1	2.2	..	0.3	0.5	..	..	..
Ireland	21.6	29.0	43.4	35.6	28.5	30.4	2.8	4.0	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.1
Italy	136.4	94.9	22.7	67.0	87.1	81.7	19.8	14.0	6.1	9.4	5.3	18.9
Japan	320.7	882.4	946.1	1 075.5	1 829.6	1 594.8	166.2	214.6	99.4	99.7	129.8	117.0
Korea	..	74.4	232.0	195.1	140.6	332.0	22.9	18.2	29.9	43.5	76.2	83.8
Luxembourg	7.7	16.9	12.0	16.7	10.8	28.4	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.7	2.4	2.3
Netherlands	81.2	104.7	106.3	216.5	310.7	204.5	32.9	34.8	11.0	2.8	0.6	2.1
New Zealand	0.2	0.1	0.8	6.3	1.4	8.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	4.6	3.7	3.4
Norway	116.7	169.2	269.4	296.9	75.8	130.6	73.8	40.4	66.3	9.9	8.5	5.8
Poland	..	..	..	6.8	27.5	12.8	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Portugal	24.0	25.8	49.3	25.9	24.2	2.4	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.2
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	0.4	0.6	0.3	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
Slovenia	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
Spain	106.3	297.7	354.5	29.0	10.0	21.1	119.3	169.8	43.7	33.3	39.6	54.4
Sweden	84.8	140.9	127.8	105.5	144.6	189.9	15.1	12.7	14.1	7.3	10.8	8.8
Switzerland	70.5	65.4	57.4	141.2	113.1	136.7	36.6	37.5	32.2	42.5	40.7	35.2
United Kingdom	206.9	257.0	499.2	343.4	377.6	173.3	20.9	61.1	79.3	69.5	130.0	161.6
United States	598.3	1 542.5	1 271.6	966.1	1 212.4	1 126.8	297.8	474.4	338.2	285.3	259.5	218.4
Sub-total	**3 051.3**	**5 423.5**	**6 352.3**	**6 972.0**	**8 385.1**	**7 699.3**	**1 173.3**	**1 765.1**	**1 897.5**	**1 481.3**	**2 064.7**	**1 553.5**
Other bilateral												
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Estonia	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	..	204.7	393.1	262.4	236.8	..	4.6	7.8	4.3	8.7	3.8
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Romania	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	204.6	293.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	..	0.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	78.3	595.1	387.7	321.9	..	..	..	..	0.0	2.7
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**283.4**	**988.3**	**854.7**	**852.4**	**..**	**4.6**	**7.8**	**4.3**	**8.7**	**6.5**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.15. Aid for trade by provider and by region, disbursements *(page 2 of 6)*

	AFRICA						AMERICA					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral												
AfDB	379.7	1 204.9	1 004.7	1 238.6	1 003.4	1 443.5	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arab Fund (AFESD)	154.9	481.3	492.2	432.8	390.2	456.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
AsDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
BADEA	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	45.7	202.6	35.4	57.7	..	..	0.7	4.8	4.8	28.9
Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	..	5.7	10.9	6.6	17.9	10.2	..	0.1	0.1	..	0.3	0.2
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	1 365.6	1 525.1	2 441.7	2 007.0	2 876.5	2 484.4	271.1	400.5	402.8	632.1	524.6	799.6
EU Institutions	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
FAO	34.2	48.2	33.6	35.2	28.2	12.1	10.6	17.3	24.5	30.0	19.8	16.4
GEF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	354.9	563.5	521.3	373.9	737.8
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ILO	..	..	0.3	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	..	91.5	108.7	138.7	140.6	152.1	..	22.8	43.5	61.8	72.3	76.4
OFID	12.4	15.6	16.2	16.0	4.8	3.9	0.6	0.7	1.4	2.0	0.2	0.2
UNDP	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNECE	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCAP	..	..	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	..	..	..	23.8	27.8	..	..	..	..	1.5	2.0
UNIDO	1 734.4	2 179.7	2 684.3	2 946.0	2 633.4	3 213.6	70.6	96.3	105.6	142.4	90.8	70.9
World Bank	..	..	..	..	0.9	0.8	..	..	..	..	0.6	0.4
WTO	4.5	4.2	2.0	1.7	3.7	1.4	2.5	1.7	0.9	1.4	3.2	1.9
Other multilateral donors	1.6	18.4	77.6	91.7	39.9	39.3	0.1	1.1	13.3	12.1	10.5	9.9
Sub-total	**3 687.3**	**5 574.5**	**6 918.0**	**7 117.1**	**7 198.8**	**7 903.5**	**355.6**	**895.3**	**1 156.4**	**1 408.0**	**1 102.6**	**1 744.8**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**7 157.7**	**10 756.7**	**13 634.2**	**14 364.3**	**14 741.2**	**15 102.7**	**1 528.9**	**2 664.9**	**3 061.7**	**2 893.6**	**3 176.0**	**3 304.7**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.15. Aid for trade by provider and by region, disbursements *(page 3 of 6)*

	ASIA						EUROPE					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries												
Australia	116.0	188.3	196.2	213.6	188.7	227.0	0.0	..	..	..	0.3	0.3
Austria	4.8	10.6	20.9	10.2	12.2	18.4	11.3	15.1	5.3	4.9	6.7	12.4
Belgium	18.3	32.2	12.6	5.8	5.6	5.1	2.6	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.5
Canada	99.6	112.5	90.6	57.7	87.1	186.5	6.7	10.8	17.2	11.6	13.3	10.6
Czech Republic	..	1.6	3.7	5.1	2.4	2.7	..	1.1	2.9	4.7	2.3	3.3
Denmark	55.3	72.2	84.1	62.7	79.6	64.4	0.1	6.8	12.8	21.6	3.8	5.0
Finland	14.7	29.6	26.5	25.8	36.1	26.1	1.1	3.1	2.9	2.0	0.3	0.0
France	167.1	194.4	299.5	369.8	361.9	660.4	78.3	65.1	18.8	3.7	61.9	294.8
Germany	713.4	955.5	1 149.7	1 986.8	993.1	1 488.5	176.0	252.3	362.9	658.2	264.5	524.3
Greece	4.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8	13.3	0.0	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	0.1	0.4	3.1	2.2	..	..	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2
Iceland	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.0	..
Ireland	7.8	5.6	3.1	1.0	1.3	2.0	0.2	0.0	..	..	..	..
Italy	45.7	40.2	29.5	80.2	22.9	162.4	25.6	41.5	12.2	20.1	7.9	3.5
Japan	3 035.4	3 454.1	4 688.5	4 857.5	4 967.5	6 453.2	183.0	321.8	125.7	65.6	69.1	111.5
Korea	121.2	274.0	334.1	411.7	326.6	325.6	14.4	17.0	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.9
Luxembourg	4.6	6.2	4.7	5.5	2.6	5.4	2.6	3.1	1.8	0.2	0.2	2.1
Netherlands	74.9	57.9	28.5	22.4	25.9	29.9	14.5	8.6	0.1	..	0.0	0.0
New Zealand	7.2	9.1	19.0	27.0	22.6	22.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Norway	90.3	67.7	60.2	51.1	33.5	28.4	16.1	13.8	10.3	10.5	9.7	8.5
Poland	..	..	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.8	..	..	1.1	3.4	2.8	2.2
Portugal	1.6	0.9	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.2	9.6	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0
Slovak Republic	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	..	..	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.1
Slovenia	..	0.1	0.0	..	0.0	0.1	..	1.8	0.5	0.5	1.4	1.0
Spain	82.8	88.8	13.7	3.6	4.0	3.2	102.0	81.1	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.2
Sweden	51.6	42.5	44.7	41.0	37.6	57.7	25.0	34.5	28.5	32.2	28.4	30.5
Switzerland	70.9	64.8	87.5	116.9	114.3	117.3	22.1	20.3	25.6	19.4	28.8	31.2
United Kingdom	357.2	433.2	319.5	339.7	285.1	421.2	6.5	1.5	1.2	0.8	1.5	0.9
United States	3 241.2	2 392.0	1 479.9	1 141.1	979.1	775.1	145.9	145.5	167.4	138.2	84.2	139.3
Sub-total	**8 386.2**	**8 535.0**	**8 997.7**	**9 837.2**	**8 593.8**	**11 086.1**	**854.6**	**1 059.8**	**798.7**	**999.2**	**588.9**	**1 183.4**
Other bilateral												
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.5
Estonia	..	..	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.5	..	..	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.9
Kazakhstan	..	..	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	63.5	66.3	83.7	142.0	76.1	..	2.3	6.6	27.0	9.2	8.3
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0
Lithuania	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	..	..	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.1
Romania	..	..	..	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	0.3	0.4	1.2	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	6.8	3.7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	18.5	18.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	33.0	..	..	..	..	..	0.9	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	57.9	126.0	481.3	235.9	178.9	..	..	14.6	17.0	0.1	17.1
Sub-total	**..**	**154.4**	**192.9**	**573.0**	**401.1**	**274.6**	**..**	**3.2**	**21.9**	**45.4**	**11.4**	**27.0**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.15. Aid for trade by provider and by region, disbursements *(page 4 of 6)*

	ASIA						EUROPE					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral												
AfDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arab Fund (AFESD)	78.4	211.6	175.5	60.2	49.1	71.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
AsDB	..	470.3	1 169.1	1 493.5	1 421.5	1 290.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
BADEA	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12.6	2.0	1.4	1.4	..
CEB	..	..	18.3	2.6	..	141.2	..	..	..	..	..	12.8
Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	..	4.3	4.4	0.5	2.8	2.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	207.2	295.6	401.2	842.6	893.2	1 100.7	248.8	1 475.0	3 336.4	2 872.7	3 509.2	2 629.2
EU Institutions	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
FAO	13.4	19.1	40.0	61.4	40.9	20.4	0.5	2.1	8.0	11.5	8.2	6.6
GEF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ILO	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	..	46.6	58.6	90.0	129.9	119.4	..	6.9	8.8	5.0	22.4	6.1
OFID	9.6	12.8	9.1	6.9	1.7	4.3	0.6	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.3
UNDP	0.0	0.1	0.2	..	0.0	0.3	1.3	4.1	3.3	5.2	5.5	5.2
UNECE	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCAP	0.0	..	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	..	..	..	13.1	13.7	..	..	..	..	1.3	1.7
UNIDO	1 427.3	1 476.9	1 932.3	2 498.6	1 831.4	2 493.8	88.5	80.1	42.4	25.2	40.8	29.3
World Bank	..	..	..	..	1.5	1.2	..	..	..	..	0.4	0.4
WTO	1.4	2.0	1.6	2.2	3.6	2.4	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other multilateral donors	0.1	2.1	10.2	14.1	16.7	7.5	..	0.0	0.3	0.6	1.2	0.6
Sub-total	**1 737.3**	**2 541.8**	**3 821.4**	**5 073.7**	**4 406.0**	**5 270.8**	**340.1**	**1 581.6**	**3 402.1**	**2 922.3**	**3 590.6**	**2 692.4**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**10 123.5**	**11 231.2**	**13 011.9**	**15 483.9**	**13 400.9**	**16 631.4**	**1 194.7**	**2 644.5**	**4 222.8**	**3 966.9**	**4 191.0**	**3 902.8**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.15. Aid for trade by provider and by region, disbursements *(page 5 of 6)*

	OCEANIA						NON-REGION SPECIFIC					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries												
Australia	107.4	108.9	105.2	150.0	128.7	157.6	27.3	70.6	47.3	36.1	69.2	32.0
Austria	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.1	4.0	12.0	13.8	11.9	12.3	7.6
Belgium	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	34.9	127.7	36.5	48.8	52.8	47.1
Canada	0.0	1.0	0.4	0.2	0.1	5.7	17.1	99.4	10.3	11.0	3.5	2.7
Czech Republic	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0
Denmark	..	..	..	..	..	..	9.2	12.9	16.3	30.8	33.5	31.4
Finland	0.0	0.0	0.1	..	..	..	18.9	31.7	29.4	22.7	25.1	88.5
France	5.6	6.4	6.0	6.0	7.6	4.0	103.3	205.6	190.2	134.9	141.8	165.8
Germany	0.3	0.9	2.2	18.7	1.0	1.3	115.1	488.7	266.0	569.4	745.1	568.3
Greece	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	0.2	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.8	0.0	..	..
Iceland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.5	6.0	5.3	5.8	6.2
Ireland	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.4	5.5	7.2	1.8	6.5	9.1
Italy	0.1	..	0.5	0.7	..	0.5	0.8	0.3	2.8	33.2	10.0	19.3
Japan	75.7	66.9	58.0	72.2	81.6	247.8	47.5	49.8	86.9	80.3	102.5	89.2
Korea	1.1	1.9	1.8	2.6	2.1	1.8	3.7	3.4	9.2	14.5	6.7	5.5
Luxembourg	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	3.6	8.8	12.2	13.7	20.2	16.8
Netherlands	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	266.3	280.6	404.0	355.6	392.7	312.3
New Zealand	22.2	42.2	75.1	77.9	74.7	68.4	0.6	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.8	1.3
Norway	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	74.9	75.3	129.2	244.9	224.9	258.7
Poland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2
Portugal	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.7	0.5	0.6
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.2
Slovenia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1
Spain	..	..	..	..	..	..	13.0	138.8	4.1	0.5	4.6	8.2
Sweden	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	100.9	132.9	181.5	107.2	151.5	185.6
Switzerland	..	0.0	..	..	..	0.0	52.7	56.0	61.1	71.3	60.9	65.3
United Kingdom	0.9	0.7	0.0	..	..	0.1	158.6	161.7	302.1	943.2	783.0	800.7
United States	12.4	28.0	0.9	0.7	..	1.5	167.1	210.8	293.1	340.6	399.7	371.0
Sub-total	**226.0**	**257.3**	**250.3**	**329.1**	**296.3**	**488.7**	**1 223.0**	**2 175.9**	**2 113.9**	**3 079.6**	**3 254.2**	**3 093.7**
Other bilateral												
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	0.1	1.8	2.3
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	8.7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Estonia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.4
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.3	1.7	0.0
Kuwait	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	..	..
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	0.1
Romania	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	4.4	26.2	3.2	1.1	..	1.3	3.4	..	6.6	13.7
Sub-total	**..**	**0.1**	**4.4**	**26.2**	**12.0**	**1.1**	**..**	**1.3**	**3.7**	**0.6**	**10.1**	**16.5**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.15. Aid for trade by provider and by region, disbursements *(page 6 of 6)*

	OCEANIA						NON-REGION SPECIFIC					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral												
AfDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	3.8	3.0	..	1.9	..
AsDB	..	16.4	82.9	79.7	77.1	89.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
BADEA	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	0.3	0.4	..	1.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	3.4
Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	..	0.1	0.6	0.5	2.3	2.6	..	..	..	..	..	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	26.3	24.0	33.9	45.4	19.9	26.1	96.3	139.6	103.9	92.1	95.6	111.7
EU Institutions	..	..	..	..	..	..	131.7	273.6	271.7	316.7	..	..
FAO	..	3.3	7.0	6.9	1.7	2.4	7.0	6.1	12.6	19.6	14.8	7.5
GEF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IDB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ILO	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	29.6	51.9	58.0	66.2	54.9	52.8
ITC	..	0.3	3.7	1.5	3.0	..	..	0.2	0.7	0.9	0.6	1.3
OFID	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	..	..	3.6	3.1	0.4	..	..
UNDP	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.2
UNECE	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCAP	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.2	0.0	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	9.0	12.3
UNIDO	3.3	21.6	44.0	69.9	77.0	80.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
World Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9.9	9.9
WTO	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	3.5	7.4	7.2	6.3	12.5	6.5
Other multilateral donors	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.8	0.8	1.8	0.5	0.1	12.6	12.6	12.9	15.5
Sub-total	**30.0**	**66.0**	**172.8**	**205.1**	**181.9**	**203.5**	**269.2**	**486.6**	**472.8**	**514.8**	**212.1**	**221.1**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**256.1**	**323.4**	**427.5**	**560.3**	**490.1**	**693.3**	**1 492.2**	**2 663.7**	**2 590.3**	**3 595.1**	**3 476.4**	**3 331.2**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962381

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.16. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, commitments *(page 1 of 6)*

	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES							OTHER LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries														
Australia	24.0	29.6	74.5	106.4	94.7	87.1	115.7	1.2	0.0	9.3	5.2	0.4	0.3	0.5
Austria	15.9	10.0	6.7	21.0	11.0	9.6	17.6	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	0.0
Belgium	65.0	100.6	178.2	95.5	128.2	64.3	123.3	0.9	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	..
Canada	86.3	165.8	233.3	145.9	266.7	116.5	28.4	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0
Czech Republic	..	..	1.1	2.3	2.0	2.2	3.0	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	..
Denmark	211.7	169.9	96.6	266.8	41.8	56.9	87.2	..	..	13.4	12.6	7.1	..	..
Finland	9.0	28.4	85.0	29.8	26.9	33.0	11.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.2	..
France	125.7	184.3	206.0	285.6	574.8	294.7	486.9	0.2	4.1	1.8	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.7
Germany	210.3	207.6	276.5	434.4	505.6	627.6	677.6	2.9	2.0	6.4	1.8	5.9	2.6	5.5
Greece	0.1	0.1	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	0.4	3.8	2.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iceland	..	..	1.3	4.1	1.8	1.4	1.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Ireland	21.7	30.9	42.8	33.4	24.0	27.0	26.3	0.2	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.9	1.4	1.7
Italy	98.5	67.1	48.4	52.9	49.2	17.3	128.7	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4	..	0.0
Japan	311.8	496.3	1 036.9	1 838.2	3 667.7	2 494.9	3 772.8	1.0	1.0	0.4	0.9	17.5	2.0	1.8
Korea	..	191.7	349.9	425.9	451.9	325.1	207.5	..	1.2	0.6	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.5
Luxembourg	5.0	9.2	10.2	15.1	11.7	12.6	27.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Netherlands	74.0	67.0	80.1	138.0	147.7	61.2	134.4	0.5	0.3	0.2	..	..	..	..
New Zealand	4.1	18.8	40.3	34.5	57.7	38.2	35.6	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Norway	111.0	149.0	203.2	282.8	65.0	91.0	102.0	1.3	0.0	1.5	1.6	0.8	0.1	0.2
Poland	..	..	..	6.7	27.5	68.1	11.8	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	0.0
Portugal	8.7	5.2	5.0	3.2	16.8	2.1	1.8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Slovenia	..	..	0.1	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Spain	37.4	50.7	102.8	23.5	10.0	14.4	20.5	..	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sweden	65.3	91.2	95.0	74.4	132.7	137.6	152.2	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.1	1.2	0.5	8.9
Switzerland	62.3	54.5	52.6	87.4	70.3	67.4	118.4	2.0	2.5	1.6	0.5	1.3	0.2	0.7
United Kingdom	154.4	211.7	237.7	179.5	271.2	172.2	168.0	1.7	0.3	27.2	8.8	3.1	0.1	1.9
United States	589.8	2 093.8	2 075.3	1 533.8	1 688.7	1 035.7	936.4	30.8	5.3	18.0	10.0	12.9	7.4	3.7
Sub-total	**2 292.0**	**4 433.4**	**5 539.4**	**6 121.3**	**8 345.9**	**5 861.9**	**7 397.9**	**44.2**	**18.8**	**82.5**	**44.6**	**54.2**	**16.4**	**26.1**
Other bilateral														
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Estonia	..	..	..	0.1	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	..	112.7	274.2	159.2	256.1	166.9	..	..	..	6.6	..	..	19.8
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Romania	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	104.3	102.2	309.7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	..	0.5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	142.5	104.2	430.1	0.4	12.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**255.7**	**378.5**	**693.7**	**358.7**	**488.6**	**..**	**..**	**..**	**6.6**	**..**	**..**	**19.8**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.16. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, commitments *(page 2 of 6)*

	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES							OTHER LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral														
AfDB	110.6	363.6	812.5	890.2	1 338.2	546.6	773.3	..	..	..	0.4	..	4.1	17.0
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	258.8	360.5	264.4	235.7	421.2	415.9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
AsDB	361.8	150.6	542.5	893.7	787.8	771.5	1 091.5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	8.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	76.6	86.1	90.8	211.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	..	12.5	24.6	18.4	3.0	11.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
EU Institutions	971.0	1 047.9	816.5	921.7	866.8	2 120.9	1 059.3	0.9	4.5	13.5	19.0	60.9	8.0	3.4
FAO	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	..	..	19.6	66.5	15.0	28.4	240.1	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	0.1
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	7.7	18.8	52.5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IADB	37.1	5.9	99.1	118.3	154.1	23.3	57.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IFAD	146.0	183.8	337.7	311.1	612.2	332.8	350.9	..	..	..	..	..	25.9	..
IMF	..	3.6	5.5	3.7	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	140.6	166.8	108.4	89.5	77.9	205.7	119.3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	..	141.4	145.6	235.8	162.5	170.7	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	15.0
UNDP	5.7	14.6	18.4	18.0	16.4	4.1	3.4	0.5	0.5	0.3	1.0	0.2	0.3	2.4
UNECE	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCAP	..	0.0	..	0.0	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNIDO	..	10.7	12.6	5.2	..	9.6	7.0	..	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..
World Bank	2 181.8	2 168.8	3 054.8	3 476.7	4 461.3	3 601.3	6 311.2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	2.5	1.0	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.3	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other multilateral donors	0.5	3.5	27.4	101.1	31.0	57.8	24.8	..	0.0	1.5	1.0	0.3	0.2	0.2
Sub-total	**3 955.1**	**4 381.0**	**6 370.4**	**7 407.6**	**8 944.9**	**8 407.2**	**10 900.3**	**1.4**	**5.1**	**15.6**	**21.5**	**61.4**	**38.5**	**38.0**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**6 247.2**	**8 814.5**	**12 165.4**	**13 907.3**	**17 984.4**	**14 627.8**	**18 786.8**	**45.6**	**23.9**	**98.2**	**72.7**	**115.6**	**54.9**	**83.9**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.16. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, commitments *(page 3 of 6)*

	LOWER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES							UPPER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries														
Australia	117.3	183.4	257.7	164.3	209.0	177.2	207.2	31.7	34.4	23.8	25.4	18.0	21.1	35.0
Austria	17.9	10.8	16.8	22.7	23.4	16.2	17.8	7.8	11.4	10.6	2.9	0.5	4.9	0.8
Belgium	55.6	54.5	81.9	29.0	25.1	36.2	29.3	46.0	45.4	25.7	10.1	10.0	13.3	12.1
Canada	103.0	89.7	106.2	113.5	234.6	223.1	38.1	64.6	15.8	22.3	49.2	55.7	13.2	20.4
Czech Republic	..	..	1.3	3.0	5.6	2.7	3.5	..	..	1.1	2.1	2.8	1.9	2.5
Denmark	142.1	69.9	111.6	42.8	58.9	40.4	64.9	23.8	13.6	16.4	9.6	1.2	22.2	12.4
Finland	27.5	24.3	64.4	34.0	3.5	7.4	34.9	21.5	13.6	21.4	8.6	0.8	1.3	11.5
France	274.9	821.6	666.5	1 338.0	1 708.8	970.0	1 588.1	173.5	298.7	257.8	664.5	438.2	701.7	574.6
Germany	560.8	645.6	1 086.6	2 066.2	2 155.8	2 300.2	2 049.8	338.7	624.2	827.5	1 190.2	1 735.1	1 356.0	1 183.7
Greece	3.1	4.1	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	11.6	13.3	0.0	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.1
Iceland	..	..	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	0.1	..
Ireland	2.0	6.9	7.8	4.6	4.3	4.9	4.8	0.7	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1
Italy	51.0	76.0	33.6	41.6	78.3	25.7	43.5	89.1	81.8	79.3	17.5	19.4	12.2	128.7
Japan	3 022.4	3 798.2	4 006.3	5 453.8	7 427.8	6 617.9	7 354.7	1 091.8	1 125.5	874.6	766.8	1 146.9	1 878.6	818.2
Korea	..	255.7	542.4	410.5	429.9	657.9	940.5	..	35.1	41.9	27.6	26.4	69.7	22.3
Luxembourg	6.2	9.8	7.3	8.4	7.7	4.1	8.0	4.3	4.9	2.9	1.6	0.6	1.0	1.0
Netherlands	103.4	65.8	46.3	35.6	16.2	39.4	79.4	33.8	30.2	7.2	2.2	0.9	13.9	3.8
New Zealand	7.6	8.7	13.8	26.4	29.0	15.2	41.0	6.3	6.7	26.1	35.3	27.5	12.3	43.7
Norway	32.8	62.0	55.9	31.7	24.1	9.7	29.4	31.0	26.9	44.0	21.9	12.6	5.8	3.5
Poland	..	..	..	1.6	3.9	11.5	3.8	..	..	..	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.3
Portugal	16.9	21.6	44.8	23.1	7.5	0.9	0.7	15.3	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.2
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.5	..	..	..	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Slovenia	..	..	0.1	0.2	..	0.0	0.1	..	..	1.7	0.7	0.1	0.8	0.5
Spain	96.8	267.0	217.7	24.3	14.2	13.0	22.5	205.1	302.9	125.1	24.3	13.0	11.5	57.4
Sweden	45.3	51.6	41.2	47.1	33.2	16.7	65.2	29.0	20.9	22.0	9.7	13.6	13.2	5.6
Switzerland	92.1	66.7	69.8	81.8	72.4	57.6	164.1	40.1	37.4	27.9	36.6	31.6	53.5	62.0
United Kingdom	155.3	191.7	281.2	259.2	151.3	80.6	87.7	204.2	96.5	164.8	109.0	136.4	155.0	37.7
United States	753.7	1 746.7	1 518.8	1 104.4	963.0	1 153.1	726.3	2 597.1	1 933.6	678.4	300.7	229.4	134.7	172.5
Sub-total	**5 687.6**	**8 532.2**	**9 282.0**	**11 368.4**	**13 688.6**	**12 482.1**	**13 605.7**	**5 063.3**	**4 772.2**	**3 316.5**	**3 317.2**	**3 921.2**	**4 499.6**	**3 210.8**
Other bilateral														
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.5
Estonia	..	..	..	1.2	1.2	1.7	1.1	..	..	..	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	..	197.6	214.7	190.1	341.0	77.4	..	..	3.4	38.7	48.8	121.8	13.9
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	..	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.4	..	..	..	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0
Romania	..	..	..	0.1	0.5	1.3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	255.1	741.2	180.0	..	..	..	..	121.5	..	56.7
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	..	0.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.0	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	73.0	749.2	392.5	40.7	311.0	..	..	16.5	35.7	84.7	30.5	74.0
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**271.0**	**965.2**	**839.8**	**1 126.5**	**569.9**	**..**	**..**	**21.0**	**74.5**	**255.2**	**152.6**	**145.0**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.16. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, commitments *(page 4 of 6)*

	LOWER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES							UPPER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral														
AfDB	30.9	119.6	208.8	427.7	393.3	176.3	151.2	..	..	0.5	2.4	4.8	3.4	4.0
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	129.5	636.5	497.9	1 000.9	539.4	610.7	..	..	7.8	3.5	107.8	..	..
AsDB	375.5	364.4	647.8	847.3	856.7	881.0	482.8	10.5	6.1	8.0	30.0	31.3	40.6	19.0
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1.5	24.5	10.5
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.8	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	403.3	183.4	478.9	238.9	..	..	..	216.9	250.4	10.2	120.8
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	..	0.3	0.1	..	0.3	..	..	..	0.4	1.6	0.2	0.3	0.4
EU Institutions	561.2	634.4	899.5	2 712.4	2 202.4	2 152.7	2 530.1	451.8	560.5	1 583.7	4 008.0	3 238.8	3 322.9	3 220.2
FAO	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	..	..	20.9	68.0	30.6	58.3	89.0	..	..	42.9	113.9	37.6	15.8	181.0
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	..	62.6	86.3	..	..	..	..	..	28.7	30.9
IADB	168.0	78.8	207.8	341.2	562.0	317.0	373.8	37.2	26.2	90.5	84.0	45.1	71.3	27.7
IFAD	96.4	138.3	222.4	186.7	315.1	175.5	483.7	26.3	53.7	20.8	43.1	..	2.6	99.4
IMF	..	2.7	4.1	2.9	..	..	..	..	3.0	3.8	2.9	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	33.5	61.2	63.6	39.0	157.0	51.4	27.2	13.5	16.0	9.1	6.1	..	0.5	0.5
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	..	102.3	212.5	207.1	239.5	206.5	..	..	70.1	57.8	68.2	202.2	97.2
UNDP	3.9	5.7	8.4	5.6	5.2	2.0	1.9	1.8	3.2	2.4	2.5	2.9	0.5	0.5
UNECE	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	..	..	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	..
UNESCAP	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
UNESCWA	..	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	0.0
UNIDO	..	5.7	17.5	1.2	..	24.6	1.2	..	4.6	16.4	3.8	..	24.7	2.5
World Bank	1 993.0	1 870.1	2 946.4	3 555.1	3 202.2	2 521.2	3 737.5	241.7	181.1	92.2	53.7	27.3	130.3	80.1
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	2.2	1.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	..	3.8	1.5	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.5
Other multilateral donors	0.4	0.0	11.6	18.4	14.9	17.8	6.9	0.1	0.0	0.2	9.8	14.5	4.6	21.4
Sub-total	**3 262.9**	**3 412.7**	**5 999.3**	**9 319.6**	**9 130.9**	**7 698.6**	**9 028.1**	**782.8**	**858.2**	**1 950.4**	**4 640.6**	**3 833.5**	**3 883.8**	**3 916.5**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**8 950.5**	**11 944.8**	**15 552.3**	**21 653.1**	**23 659.3**	**21 307.2**	**23 203.7**	**5 846.1**	**5 630.5**	**5 287.9**	**8 032.3**	**8 009.9**	**8 535.9**	**7 272.3**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.16. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, commitments *(page 5 of 6)*

	NON-COUNTRY SPECIFIC						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries							
Australia	32.4	64.0	129.1	84.4	90.0	108.6	69.5
Austria	3.3	20.4	40.2	39.8	36.2	44.8	39.5
Belgium	62.3	54.0	145.9	50.3	52.3	51.0	52.4
Canada	73.4	88.3	190.3	195.4	165.5	202.7	99.4
Czech Republic	..	..	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.1	0.0
Denmark	36.0	16.2	65.1	39.3	15.6	135.9	39.1
Finland	20.6	60.2	120.9	59.1	60.7	28.4	165.8
France	82.7	97.1	215.0	212.3	191.1	543.2	574.7
Germany	104.9	553.9	1 120.0	1 173.6	1 485.4	1 807.3	1 780.0
Greece	0.1	0.8	0.2	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..
Iceland	..	..	1.7	7.5	6.6	7.2	7.4
Ireland	2.0	2.5	6.7	8.5	2.6	6.6	9.8
Italy	10.7	3.7	3.5	5.0	42.7	22.3	51.7
Japan	65.7	240.3	155.5	262.3	423.6	275.5	563.1
Korea	..	6.5	6.4	13.3	22.1	7.6	13.0
Luxembourg	1.4	7.4	13.6	13.7	13.8	20.9	18.9
Netherlands	321.7	523.6	565.1	689.2	442.7	397.1	437.4
New Zealand	4.5	11.5	17.6	24.4	30.7	62.9	41.6
Norway	70.3	161.1	198.1	189.2	235.7	242.2	362.3
Poland	..	..	..	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.2
Portugal	2.5	1.3	1.2	1.2	0.8	0.8	0.7
Slovak Republic	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Slovenia	..	..	0.2	0.3	..	0.4	0.4
Spain	20.5	37.2	371.2	17.8	14.8	4.0	5.1
Sweden	85.4	162.5	171.9	242.7	111.4	177.5	150.9
Switzerland	98.9	105.0	130.9	168.1	129.5	175.1	349.7
United Kingdom	130.3	306.5	396.2	294.8	951.8	403.6	841.2
United States	306.9	315.3	405.5	520.1	593.3	644.4	578.0
Sub-total	**1 536.7**	**2 839.4**	**4 472.0**	**4 313.2**	**5 120.3**	**5 370.7**	**6 251.8**
Other bilateral							
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	2.3
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0
Estonia	..	..	..	0.2	..	0.2	0.9
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	..	0.0	..	1.0	..	..
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0
Lithuania	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Romania	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	..	32.5	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	1.3	2.4	0.1	..	40.8
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**33.9**	**2.6**	**1.2**	**0.2**	**44.1**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.16. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, commitments *(page 6 of 6)*

	NON-COUNTRY SPECIFIC						
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral							
AfDB	7.5	223.2	476.5	258.0	87.8	76.3	117.2
Arab Fund (AFESD)	..	0.0	5.5	3.1	6.9	1.7	5.0
AsDB	..	..	..	12.8	14.3	30.7	21.4
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	2.7	2.9	2.5
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	87.0	148.8	30.5	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
EU Institutions	472.7	766.0	1 007.5	981.2	585.0	1 286.8	1 547.9
FAO	..	131.7	273.6	271.7	316.7	..	..
GEF	..	..	36.6	26.4	29.4	16.9	114.3
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	5.1	53.6	17.1
IADB	..	..	35.8	42.3	36.8	35.3	16.1
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	1.0	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	2.8	8.3	7.7	3.6	1.8	3.6	2.7
ITC	..	30.1	54.2	64.9	68.9	57.4	51.4
OFID	..	..	33.1	3.1	4.1	2.3	3.9
UNDP	..	..	3.9	3.4	1.4	0.0	0.5
UNECE	..	1.3	4.2	3.4	5.2	5.5	5.7
UNESCAP	..	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.8
UNESCWA	..	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.1
UNIDO	..	6.0	15.0	2.6	..	23.6	2.7
World Bank	51.3	15.6	5.4	31.6	27.3	14.3	155.6
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	..	4.2	11.7	10.6	10.8	21.3	11.3
Other multilateral donors	0.0	0.6	7.1	23.7	24.3	27.5	64.9
Sub-total	**534.3**	**1 188.2**	**1 978.4**	**1 830.2**	**1 378.1**	**1 690.9**	**2 141.1**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**2 071.0**	**4 027.7**	**6 484.2**	**6 146.0**	**6 499.5**	**7 061.9**	**8 437.0**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962400

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.17. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, disbursements *(page 1 of 6)*

	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES						OTHER LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries												
Australia	29.3	68.2	106.4	94.7	87.1	115.7	0.0	9.4	5.2	0.4	0.3	0.5
Austria	9.3	8.5	10.3	11.8	8.6	13.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	0.0
Belgium	60.0	128.1	105.5	115.9	99.9	98.0	0.1	0.1	..	..	..	..
Canada	103.4	245.3	121.3	130.1	146.4	128.5	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.4
Czech Republic	..	1.1	2.3	2.0	2.2	3.0	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	..
Denmark	128.3	170.0	171.5	126.1	124.8	111.8	..	10.3	12.4	10.2	5.2	..
Finland	8.7	28.8	41.1	43.0	49.0	23.9	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
France	182.3	118.9	189.5	219.5	240.5	323.8	4.3	1.8	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.7
Germany	209.8	218.7	261.0	327.0	305.6	367.1	1.7	5.6	3.7	2.3	2.9	4.8
Greece	0.1	0.2	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	0.1	0.4	3.8	2.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iceland	..	1.3	4.1	1.8	1.4	1.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Ireland	30.9	42.8	33.4	24.0	27.0	26.3	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.9	1.4	1.7
Italy	107.0	40.9	36.3	56.1	27.2	60.4	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.4	..	0.2
Japan	312.8	493.7	927.2	1 355.8	1 167.1	2 075.5	1.0	0.4	0.9	1.5	2.0	8.3
Korea	54.7	149.7	218.9	283.7	256.9	247.3	0.1	1.3	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.4
Luxembourg	9.2	10.2	15.1	11.7	12.6	27.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Netherlands	60.2	61.6	106.0	76.8	84.1	108.8	0.1	0.3	0.0	..	..	..
New Zealand	9.4	18.4	37.0	36.4	38.4	34.4	..	..	..	..	..	..
Norway	120.8	160.4	187.5	169.4	137.5	119.9	0.3	1.4	1.6	0.5	0.4	0.2
Poland	..	..	6.7	27.5	68.1	11.8	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	0.0
Portugal	5.2	5.0	3.2	14.9	3.2	2.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
Slovak Republic	..	..	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Slovenia	..	0.1	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Spain	34.6	81.2	31.5	18.8	18.3	20.8	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0
Sweden	92.0	88.1	97.0	127.7	94.7	149.8	0.4	0.4	0.3	1.1	1.4	1.8
Switzerland	48.4	40.7	62.5	87.2	77.4	88.6	2.2	1.8	0.5	0.7	1.8	1.8
United Kingdom	134.2	290.8	280.2	476.5	317.0	424.9	0.2	15.1	15.9	18.2	24.6	18.3
United States	1 019.5	1 989.6	1 589.7	1 280.9	1 122.5	918.1	5.4	8.9	15.8	7.9	9.4	6.6
Sub-total	**2 770.1**	**4 462.2**	**4 645.3**	**5 119.7**	**4 521.2**	**5 504.4**	**17.3**	**58.6**	**59.5**	**47.6**	**51.6**	**45.8**
Other bilateral												
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	8.7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Estonia	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	60.4	81.9	170.5	181.8	167.1	..	..	0.1	3.8	0.3	5.3
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Romania	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	5.9	0.3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	18.4	18.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	0.5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	37.9	53.6	395.7	134.0	72.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sub-total	**..**	**98.8**	**135.6**	**572.2**	**343.3**	**258.1**	**..**	**..**	**0.1**	**3.8**	**0.3**	**5.3**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.17. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, disbursements *(page 2 of 6)*

	LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES						OTHER LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral												
AfDB	290.7	608.7	567.3	781.9	617.1	949.7	..	..	..	0.3	3.3	1.1
Arab Fund (AFESD)	81.9	179.8	233.2	197.9	107.2	128.7	..	..	..	..	..	..
AsDB	..	247.1	532.0	438.6	542.6	657.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	2.7	2.2	5.8	57.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	9.7	15.4	7.6	21.6	13.8	..	..	..	..	..	..
EU Institutions	926.1	836.8	790.9	783.6	1 129.9	1 035.7	1.8	12.8	18.4	12.3	11.2	6.2
FAO	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	17.4	28.7	26.0	33.2	27.3	10.0	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	..
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IADB	..	73.4	103.1	115.9	50.0	70.9	..	..	..	..	..	..
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	67.9	81.3	111.9	166.5	126.9	..	..	0.0	0.1	..	1.4
UNDP	14.1	18.4	18.0	16.4	4.1	3.4	0.5	0.3	1.0	0.2	0.3	2.4
UNECE	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCAP	0.0	..	0.0	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNESCWA	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
UNIDO	..	..	..	..	11.0	10.1	..	..	..	..	..	..
World Bank	1 735.0	1 879.8	2 369.3	2 518.7	2 424.9	3 328.5	..	..	..	..	..	..
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
WTO	2.5	1.0	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other multilateral donors	1.6	15.3	60.2	75.6	30.8	20.1	..	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2
Sub-total	**3 069.3**	**3 966.7**	**4 800.1**	**5 084.0**	**5 139.7**	**6 412.7**	**2.3**	**13.1**	**19.6**	**13.2**	**15.0**	**11.3**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**5 839.4**	**8 527.7**	**9 581.0**	**10 775.9**	**10 004.3**	**12 175.2**	**19.6**	**71.7**	**79.3**	**64.6**	**66.8**	**62.4**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.17. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, disbursements *(page 3 of 6)*

	LOWER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES						UPPER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries												
Australia	151.2	194.3	164.3	209.0	177.2	207.2	28.6	27.0	25.4	18.0	21.1	35.0
Austria	7.4	9.0	11.2	12.1	10.2	15.9	6.5	5.3	2.3	0.9	2.7	2.0
Belgium	34.1	71.3	34.2	30.7	23.7	29.7	36.0	35.9	20.8	14.8	14.9	14.1
Canada	81.0	112.4	109.6	100.2	136.1	120.1	28.1	24.2	23.4	33.8	32.0	28.0
Czech Republic	..	1.2	3.1	5.6	2.3	3.1	..	1.0	2.1	2.8	1.7	2.3
Denmark	106.2	81.8	75.6	64.3	58.7	66.1	12.7	17.8	22.1	18.5	25.4	17.2
Finland	11.7	29.3	33.3	31.0	22.2	19.4	9.5	8.5	10.2	15.8	3.0	11.4
France	300.6	461.2	807.2	755.5	901.4	1 322.1	247.0	294.1	548.3	373.6	500.2	591.8
Germany	583.9	779.9	1 058.2	1 944.7	1 471.5	1 937.6	400.9	598.8	889.1	1 512.7	1 343.3	986.6
Greece	4.1	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.6	13.3	0.0	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
Iceland	..	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	..	..	0.0	0.0	..	0.1	..
Ireland	6.9	7.8	4.6	4.3	4.9	4.8	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1
Italy	73.3	35.7	24.9	35.0	21.3	55.0	55.3	63.8	20.3	61.5	21.1	130.9
Japan	2 595.1	3 159.3	3 717.9	4 192.0	4 043.0	4 725.3	897.5	950.7	1 002.8	442.9	827.0	896.6
Korea	86.7	177.3	261.4	285.9	288.7	262.4	53.0	39.0	24.7	26.2	36.7	32.5
Luxembourg	9.8	7.3	8.4	7.7	4.1	8.0	4.9	2.9	1.6	0.6	1.0	1.0
Netherlands	70.9	59.1	30.2	25.8	27.7	32.1	36.4	21.1	4.0	1.7	6.5	6.3
New Zealand	7.5	10.8	18.5	21.8	18.1	20.7	6.6	13.9	24.4	30.4	19.5	17.6
Norway	57.3	50.6	39.6	23.1	17.6	19.9	84.8	45.8	64.6	14.3	11.1	6.2
Poland	..	..	1.6	3.8	11.4	3.7	..	..	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.2
Portugal	19.4	45.3	36.4	7.6	0.8	0.7	9.7	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2
Slovak Republic	..	..	0.3	0.5	0.9	0.4	..	..	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0
Slovenia	..	0.0	0.2	..	0.0	0.0	..	1.7	0.4	0.5	1.2	0.7
Spain	132.4	267.6	32.3	15.6	19.3	21.4	252.3	202.3	22.7	14.5	18.5	26.0
Sweden	60.1	56.0	50.4	37.7	33.9	43.7	22.2	23.7	20.0	16.9	11.3	14.9
Switzerland	64.9	56.3	72.4	81.2	67.5	87.8	36.4	24.0	28.7	31.4	45.6	38.3
United Kingdom	236.8	296.0	337.9	273.3	292.7	311.1	169.3	165.8	192.9	118.1	121.5	69.3
United States	753.5	1 333.2	1 162.7	882.1	804.1	586.9	2 362.3	628.1	356.0	251.8	197.5	173.3
Sub-total	**5 454.8**	**7 305.0**	**8 096.8**	**9 050.4**	**8 459.3**	**9 905.0**	**4 772.7**	**3 210.2**	**3 307.4**	**3 002.2**	**3 264.4**	**3 102.6**
Other bilateral												
Azerbaijan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.5
Estonia	..	..	0.8	1.2	0.9	1.1	..	..	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Kazakhstan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kuwait	..	167.0	164.2	198.9	489.0	179.8	..	23.8	23.4	35.5	21.9	21.0
Latvia	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lithuania	..	..	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.4	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0
Romania	..	..	0.3	0.5	1.3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	0.9	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	3.5	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Turkey	..	0.4	..	..	..	..	..	1.0	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	44.2	615.7	469.4	287.0	475.1	..	5.1	31.2	32.4	1.4	23.0
Sub-total	**..**	**211.6**	**781.0**	**671.3**	**778.8**	**656.4**	**..**	**29.9**	**54.6**	**68.1**	**27.0**	**44.6**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.17. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, disbursements *(page 4 of 6)*

	LOWER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES						UPPER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Multilateral												
AfDB	49.4	200.5	331.7	363.1	238.6	339.5	..	0.1	1.3	1.7	1.8	4.5
Arab Fund (AFESD)	137.7	480.6	403.3	268.8	296.5	373.6	13.6	32.5	29.7	24.3	35.6	20.2
AsDB	..	228.8	686.3	1 086.7	879.4	649.1	..	10.7	21.1	18.5	38.9	41.9
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	12.6	2.0	1.4	1.4	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	44.1	129.3	23.3	144.4	..	..	17.8	78.3	11.1	39.6
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	0.1	0.1	..	0.2	0.1	..	0.4	0.5	..	1.4	1.5
EU Institutions	484.8	704.7	1 766.4	1 717.0	2 245.5	2 349.3	398.0	1 605.3	3 447.5	3 390.4	3 634.4	3 050.8
FAO	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
GEF	16.3	18.2	25.2	32.3	23.8	13.6	15.2	25.6	49.8	69.5	38.5	32.1
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IADB	..	173.9	337.7	311.8	222.1	558.5	..	80.2	87.4	53.4	62.1	78.8
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	0.2	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID	..	58.8	96.4	150.8	142.8	112.1	..	39.6	44.5	29.6	57.3	77.1
UNDP	5.5	8.4	5.6	5.2	2.0	1.9	3.1	2.4	2.5	2.9	0.5	0.5
UNECE	..	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	..	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	..
UNESCAP	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
UNESCWA	0.0	..	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	0.0	..	..	0.0
UNIDO	..	..	..	..	12.7	13.1	..	..	..	..	7.5	9.1
World Bank	1 473.0	1 838.6	2 321.6	3 085.1	2 186.2	2 394.3	114.0	105.5	101.2	50.8	40.5	134.8
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..
WTO	2.2	1.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	3.8	1.5	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.5
Other multilateral donors	0.0	2.9	20.3	26.1	17.3	7.2	0.0	0.4	8.6	6.8	4.6	10.9
Sub-total	**2 169.0**	**3 716.7**	**6 039.3**	**7 176.4**	**6 290.6**	**6 957.1**	**547.8**	**1 916.8**	**3 814.8**	**3 727.9**	**3 936.3**	**3 502.5**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**7 623.8**	**11 233.3**	**14 917.0**	**16 898.1**	**15 528.7**	**17 518.4**	**5 320.5**	**5 156.9**	**7 176.9**	**6 798.1**	**7 227.7**	**6 649.7**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.17. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, disbursements *(page 5 of 6)*

	NON-COUNTRY SPECIFIC					
	2006-08 avg.	2009-11 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries						
Australia	44.7	92.1	84.4	90.0	108.6	69.5
Austria	15.3	37.0	35.1	22.7	26.9	33.5
Belgium	45.5	147.1	43.9	53.1	57.2	50.9
Canada	60.2	183.9	186.7	82.6	79.2	186.6
Czech Republic	..	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.1	0.0
Denmark	13.2	50.4	54.4	49.9	40.9	37.4
Finland	31.1	69.6	70.5	65.7	52.3	113.7
France	104.9	216.9	200.3	154.6	286.0	232.4
Germany	477.0	955.5	970.4	1 407.1	1 490.5	1 226.3
Greece	0.8	0.2	..	..	..	..
Hungary	..	..	1.9	0.0	..	..
Iceland	..	1.7	7.5	6.6	7.2	7.4
Ireland	2.5	6.7	8.5	2.6	6.6	9.8
Italy	4.3	2.3	5.5	48.0	28.8	43.8
Japan	233.9	156.8	257.6	415.4	278.0	558.6
Korea	6.2	6.0	12.9	16.9	7.8	13.9
Luxembourg	7.4	13.6	13.7	13.8	20.9	18.9
Netherlands	309.2	332.7	478.3	436.2	497.7	395.1
New Zealand	7.5	10.5	18.2	25.8	29.5	25.6
Norway	115.4	125.4	190.7	275.0	237.7	280.7
Poland	..	..	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2
Portugal	1.3	1.2	1.2	0.8	0.8	0.7
Slovak Republic	..	..	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Slovenia	..	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.4
Spain	41.0	257.0	25.0	20.5	23.4	22.2
Sweden	153.5	177.9	229.1	154.0	193.5	231.3
Switzerland	94.0	101.9	131.5	170.0	178.5	115.5
United Kingdom	287.1	409.9	466.5	1 074.6	1 060.0	1 095.3
United States	262.6	372.2	426.1	499.5	614.5	721.6
Sub-total	**2 318.6**	**3 728.8**	**3 920.9**	**5 086.9**	**5 327.2**	**5 491.5**
Other bilateral						
Azerbaijan	..	..	0.1	0.1	1.8	2.3
Chinese Taipei	..	..	..	..	..	..
Croatia	..	..	..	..	..	0.0
Estonia	..	..	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.7
Kazakhstan	..	..	0.1	0.7	1.8	0.1
Kuwait	..	0.0	0.0	..	..	..
Latvia	..	..	..	..	..	0.0
Lithuania	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Romania	..	..	..	0.0	0.0	..
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	..	..
Thailand	..	..	..	..	0.1	..
Turkey	..	32.5	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	1.3	3.4	0.1	6.8	13.9
Sub-total	**..**	**33.9**	**3.7**	**1.1**	**10.7**	**17.2**

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.17. Aid for trade by provider and by income group, disbursements *(page 6 of 6)*

	NON-COUNTRY SPECIFIC					
	2006-08 avg.	**2009-11 avg.**	**2012-14 avg.**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Multilateral						
AfDB	39.6	395.6	104.3	91.5	142.7	148.7
Arab Fund (AFESD)	0.4	3.8	4.5	2.1	1.9	6.1
AsDB	..	0.0	12.5	29.4	37.8	31.7
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	..	..	..	..
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	0.3	0.6	..	3.6
Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF)	..	..	..	..	..	..
EU Institutions	404.6	700.2	696.7	588.6	898.1	709.7
FAO	131.7	273.6	271.7	316.7	..	..
GEF	16.9	23.5	24.8	29.6	24.0	9.7
Green Climate Fund	..	..	..	..	..	..
IADB	..	27.4	35.3	40.1	39.7	29.6
IFAD	..	..	..	..	..	..
IMF	..	..	0.0	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	..	..	..	..	..	..
ITC	29.6	51.9	58.0	66.2	54.9	52.8
OFID	..	1.9	1.9	5.6	2.2	37.8
UNDP	..	3.9	3.4	1.4	0.0	0.5
UNECE	1.3	4.2	3.4	5.2	5.5	5.7
UNESCAP	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.8
UNESCWA	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1
UNIDO	..	..	..	..	17.5	25.2
World Bank	2.0	30.8	16.5	27.6	21.7	30.3
World Tourism Organisation	..	..	..	..	13.2	12.7
WTO	4.2	11.7	10.6	10.8	21.3	11.3
Other multilateral donors	0.6	3.0	25.1	23.1	29.1	36.4
Sub-total	**631.0**	**1 532.3**	**1 269.7**	**1 239.4**	**1 310.3**	**1 152.6**
TOTAL AID FOR TRADE	**2 949.6**	**5 295.0**	**5 194.3**	**6 327.4**	**6 648.2**	**6 661.2**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962419

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.18. Trade related other official flows by category

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Trade Policy and Regulations													
Trade Policy and Admin. Management	285.1	138.1	283.9	267.7	138.3	938.6	609.3	56.0	150.8	73.6	53.6	76.7	72.4
Trade Facilitation	82.5	28.6	215.1	413.7	501.8	960.2	662.2	16.3	157.7	418.6	451.9	180.8	735.6
Regional Trade Agreements	67.0	0.0	13.7	0.0		4.3	32.0	0.0	15.1	..	..	4.3	4.7
Multilateral Trade Negotiations	..	11.7	3.2	..	..	..	..	11.2	..	..	..	..	..
Trade Education/Training	..	..	..	214.9	250.1	73.1	0.0	..	..	7.4	4.3	4.7	5.4
Sub-total	**434.5**	**178.4**	**515.9**	**896.3**	**890.2**	**1 976.2**	**1 303.5**	**83.5**	**323.6**	**499.6**	**509.9**	**266.5**	**818.2**
Economic Infrastructure													
Transport and Storage	5 659.5	8 301.3	11 813.2	11 885.3	13 795.4	11 873.4	13 735.0	2 633.1	6 968.0	7 888.5	9 391.7	9 914.7	9 269.3
Communications	612.1	692.7	687.8	1 245.5	1 161.8	1 514.1	955.1	343.0	705.9	861.7	615.0	1 315.7	509.6
Energy Generation and Supply	2 187.0	6 075.5	12 486.2	10 414.8	13 567.0	21 940.7	15 243.3	1 216.3	6 386.8	6 038.8	11 308.0	9 943.7	10 829.2
Sub-total	**8 458.6**	**15 069.4**	**24 987.2**	**23 545.6**	**28 524.3**	**35 328.3**	**29 933.4**	**4 192.4**	**14 060.7**	**14 789.0**	**21 314.7**	**21 174.1**	**20 608.1**
Building Productive Capacity													
Business And Other Services	579.4	1 318.6	2 043.6	690.2	1 891.5	1 134.2	1 648.9	715.3	1 375.5	653.8	1 054.0	1 075.3	821.3
Banking & Financial Services	2 409.7	2 592.2	8 203.0	11 328.9	15 518.4	11 303.4	9 906.1	1 688.8	7 345.4	6 187.7	9 471.3	8 292.1	8 876.8
Agriculture	1 219.9	1 128.7	2 073.0	2 337.6	2 552.6	3 164.2	4 686.3	717.3	1 107.6	1 392.2	1 382.0	1 630.7	1 955.5
Forestry	84.9	68.1	323.2	303.5	128.1	296.3	144.6	52.1	174.0	197.3	149.8	180.3	178.4
Fishing	7.7	1.5	46.9	206.3	119.9	81.7	84.5	1.6	21.3	31.5	100.1	112.3	100.6
Industry	1 576.6	4 210.8	4 185.8	6 433.1	8 933.7	12 186.4	7 968.5	2 041.8	4 003.3	5 041.1	8 210.6	8 871.3	5 827.7
Mineral Resources and Mining	260.5	897.1	1 932.8	1 711.5	3 295.4	1 669.2	4 573.8	657.1	1 454.1	995.3	1 660.7	2 024.1	647.4
Tourism	114.3	80.6	241.6	243.9	208.1	250.6	192.6	53.8	94.9	105.7	121.4	139.5	217.0
Sub-total	**6 253.0**	**10 297.6**	**19 049.9**	**23 255.0**	**32 647.6**	**30 085.9**	**29 205.4**	**5 927.9**	**15 576.1**	**14 604.7**	**22 149.8**	**22 325.7**	**18 624.7**
TOTAL TRADE-RELATED OOF	**15 146.2**	**25 545.5**	**44 553.0**	**47 696.9**	**62 062.1**	**67 390.4**	**60 442.3**	**10 203.9**	**29 960.4**	**29 893.3**	**43 974.4**	**43 766.3**	**40 051.1**
Shares in total													
Trade Policy and Regulations	*2.9%*	*0.7%*	*1.2%*	*1.9%*	*1.4%*	*2.9%*	*2.2%*	*0.8%*	*1.1%*	*1.7%*	*1.2%*	*0.6%*	*2.0%*
Economic Infrastructure	*55.8%*	*59.0%*	*56.1%*	*49.4%*	*46.0%*	*52.4%*	*49.5%*	*41.1%*	*46.9%*	*49.5%*	*48.5%*	*48.4%*	*51.5%*
Building Productive Capacity	*41.3%*	*40.3%*	*42.8%*	*48.8%*	*52.6%*	*44.6%*	*48.3%*	*58.1%*	*52.0%*	*48.9%*	*50.4%*	*51.0%*	*46.5%*
Share in sector allocable OOF	***45.7%***	***63.7%***	***64.8%***	***71.9%***	***69.7%***	***73.1%***	***64.1%***	***59.4%***	***61.6%***	***68.9%***	***70.4%***	***71.1%***	***73.1%***
Share in total OOF	***43.4%***	***58.5%***	***61.9%***	***69.1%***	***66.9%***	***69.7%***	***60.6%***	***44.4%***	***56.9%***	***61.7%***	***60.3%***	***66.0%***	***65.8%***

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962438

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.19. Trade related other official flows by individual provider

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
DAC countries													
Australia	..	0.9	13.6	28.9	11.9	14.9	9.0	2.7	13.6	28.9	11.9	14.9	9.0
Austria	1.4	..	..	..	..	95.4	61.3	..	..	..	..	182.1	86.8
Belgium	..	..	0.0	49.9	90.8	5.7	186.7	..	..	93.4	90.8	162.8	143.7
Canada	..	..	4.0	16.1	..	..	..	..	4.0	16.1	..	..	..
Denmark	7.2	..	..	..	..	97.4	70.6	..	..	13.2	32.2	49.8	46.3
Finland	16.0	30.0	41.0	31.7	42.4	77.4	162.5	29.8	40.0	26.3	46.0	66.2	90.6
France	235.2	279.9	912.4	1 240.7	892.7	894.0	1 049.3	263.0	622.6	973.5	1 116.3	956.3	833.7
Germany	..	1 036.1	1 074.8	1 041.7	888.6	748.2	920.4	850.4	1 172.5	1 067.9	956.8	773.1	945.5
Greece	..	1.3	..	..	..	..	..	1.3	..	..	..	..	..
Italy	..	..	0.4	1.6	..	..	..	..	0.4	..	..	2.4	..
Japan	921.7	1 380.7	..	..	..	..	..	25.1	..	..	..	..	..
Korea	..	1 866.9	4 382.9	6 216.1	11 896.1	8 704.1	6 642.5	1 703.9	3 793.2	5 549.2	12 742.9	9 191.9	6 046.0
Netherlands	7.9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Norway	..	..	..	109.5	578.8	584.2	460.6	..	..	125.6	779.2	179.8	136.1
Poland	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	0.0
Portugal	..	..	0.4	2.8	2.3	1.1	2.3	..	0.4	2.2	1.5	1.7	1.1
Spain	..	2.1	..	4.4	0.0	..	1.4	..	..	4.9	0.0	..	1.4
Sweden	1.6	0.0	..	45.2	55.8	21.7	46.8	0.1	..	32.7	37.4	..	51.7
Switzerland	..	..	..	6.6	..	..	..	..	..	6.6	26.1	16.9	98.9
United Kingdom	183.4	13.2	102.2	63.4	..	..	..	..	102.2	63.4	..	869.1	..
United States	189.0	399.4	733.6	469.0	349.4	1 203.3	353.5	126.7	362.6	261.3	296.9	424.5	675.9
Sub-total	**1 563.3**	**5 010.5**	**7 265.2**	**9 327.7**	**14 808.8**	**12 447.6**	**9 966.8**	**3 002.9**	**6 111.3**	**8 265.2**	**16 138.2**	**12 891.4**	**9 166.8**
Other bilateral													
Estonia	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.1
Kuwait	..	..	..	..	..	..		..	..	..	..	..	0.2
Saudi Arabia	..	..	..	..	..	..	30.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
United Arab Emirates	..	..	..	..	..	..		..	12.7	21.1	33.8	0.8	..
Sub-total	**..**	**..**	**..**			**..**	**30.1**	**..**	**12.7**	**21.1**	**33.8**	**0.8**	**0.3**
Multilateral													
AfDB	337.9	938.4	3 519.2	1 788.8	3 261.7	4 530.8	3 729.6	487.2	2 129.5	2 108.4	1 994.2	2 674.2	3 727.3
AsDB	*3 350.6*	*3 785.2*	*4 451.9*	*6 333.8*	*8 595.8*	*6 836.4*	*13 357.6*	..	*2 175.5*	*3 897.5*	*4 999.4*	*7 154.7*	*7 247.9*
Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank	..	..	..	..	..	*1 214.2*	*1 618.0*	..	..	..	..	*9.9*	*691.3*
Caribbean Development Bank	..	..	..	..	*9.1*	*95.4*	*113.1*	..	..	..	..	..	..
CEB	..	..	*150.5*	*206.3*	*132.6*	..	*408.6*	..	*133.5*	*205.3*	*234.8*	*216.5*	*129.1*
Climate Investment Funds	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	38.5	..	10.3	..
EU Institutions	1 988.4	4 745.4	2 781.0	948.5	655.1	1 575.4	1 323.9	1 438.0	3 047.2	870.8	491.6	1 704.0	1 344.9
European Bank for Reconstruction and Development		0.0	3 771.5	4 107.1	7 033.4	5 694.8	5 335.1	..	2 657.9	3 199.9	4 698.5	5 425.8	3 318.3
Green Climate Fund		0.0	0.0	0.0	20.3	555.8	628.0	..	..	..	..	..	..
IADB	1 734.9	2 687.9	5 184.2	4 997.6	4 168.9	3 706.4	4 258.6	..	4 048.6	3 468.3	5 076.3	3 196.7	3 813.4
IDB Invest		0.0	0.0	0.0		1 910.9	2 478.9	..	..	..	..	..	1 858.4
IFAD	22.4	35.1	64.3	88.5	268.2	168.8	74.2	..	..	..	..	..	..
International Finance Corporation		0.0	0.0	7 866.6	8 435.5	10 406.8		..	..	..	..	..	..
Islamic Development Bank	520.5	1 218.0	2 313.4	2 581.5	3 150.4	7 476.3	7 839.5	..	..	..	..	..	..
OFID		0.0	451.2	563.3	499.9	627.0	709.0	..	368.6	487.1	524.8	358.6	522.8
World Bank	5 628.1	7 124.9	14 600.5	8 887.2	11 022.3	10 143.6	8 571.2	5 280.7	9 275.6	7 331.1	9 782.9	10 123.6	8 230.6
sub-total	**13 582.9**	**20 534.9**	**37 287.8**	**38 369.2**	**47 253.3**	**54 942.8**	**50 445.3**	**7 205.9**	**23 836.4**	**21 607.0**	**27 802.4**	**30 874.1**	**30 884.0**
TOTAL TRADE-RELATED OOF	**15 146.2**	**25 545.5**	**44 553.0**	**47 696.9**	**62 062.1**	**67 390.4**	**60 442.3**	**10 208.8**	**29 960.4**	**29 893.3**	**43 974.4**	**43 766.3**	**40 051.1**

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962457

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.20. Trade related other official flows by individual recipient country *(page 1 of 4)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Afghanistan	8.9	26.0	22.8	24.8	3.2	3.5	..	14.4	19.2	5.5	3.1	0.5	..
Albania	11.5	41.7	173.1	248.6	92.4	285.9	195.2	13.2	68.3	81.4	29.2	22.2	243.6
Algeria	112.7	0.0	202.8	95.0	473.9	0.0	..	4.3	202.8	79.3	341.9	6.1	..
Angola	..	6.3	28.1	326.1	4.6	148.4	370.4	3.0	29.2	190.7	0.1	439.6	149.7
Antigua and Barbuda	..	..	..	..	..	6.1	48.3	..	..	..	..	..	..
Argentina	525.5	1 357.1	829.1	511.1	397.2	1 422.7	1 547.2	165.5	971.6	728.0	662.5	611.4	953.1
Armenia	..	14.8	231.1	224.7	476.1	288.3	198.6	15.5	145.3	112.6	203.1	267.0	207.5
Azerbaijan	23.9	483.9	476.1	646.5	801.4	1 264.4	1 405.0	30.9	252.0	469.6	504.4	935.2	1 144.9
Bangladesh	113.1	253.0	461.7	727.4	1 193.6	1 556.7	2 461.3	13.3	107.9	310.3	377.8	498.3	550.9
Belarus	..	23.8	192.7	318.4	89.4	91.5	173.4	10.7	68.4	281.0	77.7	128.3	233.4
Belize	2.4	0.9	7.4	15.1	15.2	19.3	..	0.0	3.3	5.7	3.9	3.2	6.4
Benin	8.0	..	6.8	67.5	118.9	17.0	117.6	..	..	5.3	0.2	17.0	..
Bhutan	..	..	16.4	8.9	80.5	..	..	..	11.2	2.1	0.0	11.1	4.2
Bolivia	13.4	10.9	39.0	14.2	261.3	30.2	310.5	6.3	3.1	6.6	53.8	27.0	18.1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	50.6	182.4	191.2	224.1	164.4	356.7	202.2	56.7	224.4	222.4	209.3	117.3	70.6
Botswana	13.1	2.1	694.1	0.6	23.0	..	134.0	2.1	333.1	23.7	11.8	31.5	4.5
Brazil	1 701.0	1 397.9	2 704.8	2 588.6	1 297.5	2 587.6	1 916.3	520.5	2 201.4	1 276.8	2 181.9	1 874.8	2 713.9
Burkina Faso	2.4	5.0	10.3	77.6	207.5	338.6	479.7	..	1.4	..	14.1	49.0	83.6
Cabo Verde	..	19.4	32.8	40.3	..	..	..	..	38.1	14.4	14.2	6.5	10.3
Cambodia	5.2	1.4	21.2	128.2	144.3	365.9	117.0	4.6	17.6	63.3	105.6	95.2	171.1
Cameroon	4.4	10.1	46.5	106.0	794.3	881.7	496.3	17.0	41.7	33.9	62.1	33.1	115.4
Chad	8.3	21.2	52.4	67.8	153.1	..	5.4	4.5	..	0.4	..	..	..
Chile	58.3	260.6	139.5	463.5	319.9	555.0	336.6	64.3	177.1	183.0	318.0	107.6	271.6
China (People's Republic of)	2 159.9	3 023.2	3 560.6	4 396.0	5 822.1	5 173.4	4 862.1	1 578.6	2 814.5	3 453.2	5 204.5	4 438.2	4 876.2
Colombia	367.3	459.3	717.8	704.3	1 427.7	1 848.5	1 394.4	312.4	452.3	444.4	880.9	1 876.8	910.5
Comoros	..	..	1.6	..	..	20.4	22.0	..	0.8	..	..	..	..
Congo	..	0.6	..	6.9	134.9	84.6	..	..	..	0.0	0.1	0.1	28.5
Cook Islands	..	..	4.2	..	13.2	0.2	0.1	..	1.7	2.2	0.4	0.6	3.6
Costa Rica	54.0	32.0	110.7	387.0	397.8	204.1	102.6	21.8	165.9	245.4	280.8	129.4	304.8
Côte d'Ivoire	6.5	46.7	15.9	244.1	387.3	374.0	522.0	1.4	..	58.1	152.3	36.2	105.1
Cuba	1.1	..	..	..	..	12.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	..	..	0.2	1.1	..	..	..	..	0.2	1.1	..	..	..
Democratic Republic of the Congo	..	..	..	67.9	76.6	..	7.8	..	2.2	10.1	53.3	34.0	..
Djibouti	..	26.9	34.0	..	22.8	77.4	222.5	..	47.4	0.1	..	3.7	16.8
Dominica	0.3	..	..	2.8	..	..	10.0	..	..	2.7	..	..	..
Dominican Republic	126.7	34.6	356.4	213.0	232.0	182.4	127.8	46.2	202.3	70.6	344.2	38.7	45.9
Ecuador	38.7	73.1	268.3	376.4	830.1	470.5	339.0	12.2	98.4	150.5	1 303.5	274.0	351.5
Egypt	564.3	1 079.2	1 551.5	1 377.8	2 126.5	2 713.7	4 034.7	445.6	770.8	710.6	1 587.0	2 231.2	1 525.4
El Salvador	45.2	133.1	108.8	206.3	149.4	192.6	167.1	7.3	103.4	77.2	139.4	101.1	129.3
Equatorial Guinea	..	..	7.1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Eswatini	0.1	..	..	14.1	39.1	65.8	..	9.7	4.1	0.1	3.4	4.6	17.6
Ethiopia	..	17.6	15.1	92.7	182.1	127.6	179.1	..	28.6	4.6	40.1	25.9	184.4

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.20. Trade related other official flows by individual recipient country *(page 2 of 4)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Fiji	5.8	10.5	14.3	31.2	30.4	2.0	..	..	5.2	7.7	0.7	0.8	4.5
Gabon	43.7	212.8	8.8	175.8	61.4	136.6	44.0	9.1	61.3	52.2	20.3	25.4	78.0
Gambia	3.0	0.1	12.6	11.5	3.0	66.2	91.2	..	3.7	7.5	2.8	2.7	..
Georgia	0.3	40.4	359.1	351.7	428.9	524.0	540.5	21.2	239.6	144.1	314.3	556.2	313.4
Ghana	3.9	96.1	80.7	170.1	105.6	546.8	147.7	33.7	54.7	85.1	79.2	37.4	114.3
Grenada	0.5	..	4.2	..	12.7	..	5.5	0.0	1.8	1.4	6.1	1.5	6.3
Guatemala	189.4	55.1	98.4	83.4	80.2	403.3	192.4	74.2	117.6	76.0	89.4	22.1	175.1
Guinea	6.8	..	3.3	56.0	138.7	357.9	39.6	..	..	0.1	0.7	..	2.8
Guinea-Bissau	0.5	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Guyana	..	5.9	4.8	15.4	..	..	..	..	1.0	0.0	..	..	..
Haiti	..	0.2	3.7	33.9	6.0	0.7	0.5	..	2.5	5.4	4.2	0.2	0.2
Honduras	3.1	68.9	27.9	101.6	233.2	110.5	48.6	4.2	20.3	50.7	159.3	167.8	74.9
India	2 307.7	2 217.5	4 343.4	3 672.3	4 236.9	4 561.7	6 139.0	1 116.2	2 631.2	2 070.6	2 659.6	4 047.6	3 402.0
Indonesia	395.6	806.4	1 842.2	2 565.7	5 071.1	5 401.8	3 146.4	669.2	926.7	1 648.8	4 952.1	4 656.8	1 967.3
Iran	193.9	131.8	298.9	93.9	..	105.5	13.3	34.0	16.0	4.5	..	0.0	13.3
Iraq	14.2	249.1	110.6	349.6	954.1	494.3	168.0	18.9	58.3	114.1	827.8	182.2	151.5
Jamaica	29.7	31.6	207.2	107.9	248.5	162.4	88.2	0.9	133.4	89.7	107.0	152.2	101.0
Jordan	21.3	118.0	250.4	271.7	401.8	904.6	384.5	11.9	201.8	202.9	366.6	438.2	182.6
Kazakhstan	64.7	114.0	1 753.7	1 020.9	2 146.5	2 650.9	1 176.3	104.9	876.3	1 002.9	862.7	1 702.0	564.7
Kenya	12.8	41.4	84.4	475.4	632.5	773.9	302.5	29.3	67.4	144.0	375.5	552.3	187.8
Kiribati	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.3	0.1	..	..	..	0.2	0.3	0.1
Kosovo	..	..	6.3	30.8	63.5	37.2	8.7	..	3.0	4.5	7.8	26.7	18.8
Kyrgyzstan	..	..	79.6	75.5	51.3	116.1	37.2	..	31.8	65.3	24.1	96.8	12.0
Lao People's Democratic Republic	24.8	9.5	7.4	85.8	145.7	28.2	63.8	11.5	10.0	31.5	6.5	14.1	52.7
Lebanon	92.7	147.6	46.3	131.9	72.6	161.7	347.2	77.3	65.5	46.8	86.6	21.8	78.9
Lesotho	..	..	8.4	..	..	..	..	..	1.6	..	..	..	..
Liberia	..	21.7	79.5	10.5	182.5	57.1	185.5	0.9	21.4	14.4	169.5	35.0	198.6
Libya	..	2.5	0.0	15.4	..	0.0	..	0.2	0.0	0.0	..	0.0	..
Madagascar	0.7	375.5	221.0	1.5	6.0	37.2	27.6	170.5	345.6	15.4	24.3	6.5	12.6
Malawi	0.6	0.4	3.0	4.6	0.0	..	21.5	1.7	..	..	0.1	0.3	20.9
Malaysia	140.7	80.3	11.8	85.3	309.9	101.4	154.7	0.3	5.0	59.5	386.2	102.9	117.1
Maldives	..	26.4	..	3.7	..	..	145.0	..	3.7	..	..	..	..
Mali	0.3	19.7	24.3	26.2	28.0	193.4	289.8	..	..	0.0	12.4	9.1	58.6
Marshall Islands	..	..	3.3	65.0	261.2	76.9	99.7	..	3.3	12.5	261.2	76.9	99.7
Mauritania	7.3	22.2	141.8	71.0	..	70.6	45.0	9.0	24.4	80.9	19.1	7.8	13.9
Mauritius	7.0	21.6	97.1	98.6	0.3	26.5	0.3	8.8	67.8	56.8	44.4	109.6	55.8
Mexico	1 206.2	577.7	2 285.1	1 380.9	1 382.3	1 532.4	1 234.3	551.8	2 137.7	1 054.9	870.1	701.1	982.6
Micronesia	..	..	..	1.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	..	..	0.2	0.2	2.4	1.7
Moldova	0.9	23.1	74.5	154.2	131.4	131.6	178.4	1.5	54.5	53.1	48.8	95.5	55.7
Mongolia	..	..	116.8	292.5	1 002.7	325.6	212.7	..	87.4	149.8	97.1	601.4	222.9
Montenegro	..	19.3	162.0	83.6	125.3	11.5	39.2	15.9	79.1	77.4	62.4	77.7	56.3
Morocco	422.7	603.0	977.1	1 229.1	1 670.8	988.5	1 053.8	233.9	588.0	769.9	802.8	959.1	1 233.8
Mozambique	43.7	9.5	46.6	47.5	268.8	34.8	558.4	19.4	31.6	9.4	18.5	4.4	94.0

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.20. Trade related other official flows by individual recipient country *(page 3 of 4)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Myanmar	..	..	..	31.3	335.4	107.2	175.5	..	..	4.9	2.4	138.1	199.5
Namibia	20.4	15.6	33.4	92.1	101.8	357.7	255.8	20.9	33.8	24.2	94.7	205.5	379.2
Nauru	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..
Nepal	..	..	..	21.7	3.1	..	..	..	..	..	0.0	..	..
Nicaragua	2.8	35.2	43.7	86.1	12.4	86.5	93.4	14.0	17.0	47.1	32.2	26.2	61.9
Niger	2.4	6.2	7.4	28.1	31.8	146.2	34.5	..	6.0	5.6	0.0	23.9	7.7
Nigeria	52.1	127.4	211.7	931.7	896.2	843.1	523.2	25.7	150.6	322.5	559.8	398.7	692.5
North Macedonia	13.9	66.2	158.7	220.0	258.6	24.9	21.5	20.0	94.5	125.3	74.0	84.8	37.6
Pakistan	687.2	851.2	657.2	1 041.3	1 074.4	2 993.8	3 439.0	138.2	300.2	420.7	452.1	808.2	1 158.7
Palau	..	..	..	..	0.3	17.2	0.2	..	..	..	0.3	6.3	6.2
Panama	33.4	255.4	512.7	309.7	694.2	1 049.7	400.3	18.0	238.6	495.0	612.3	497.3	677.5
Papua New Guinea	16.4	31.0	32.4	119.7	56.8	102.2	540.9	10.3	9.6	54.1	76.3	100.0	84.1
Paraguay	9.7	164.9	118.8	273.7	367.8	258.1	325.4	18.9	118.9	143.7	190.4	135.3	186.4
Peru	258.1	410.0	564.3	653.2	419.0	1 062.6	357.6	159.8	572.4	211.8	681.5	198.8	187.4
Philippines	109.3	1 119.1	201.1	702.1	1 488.5	272.6	552.2	143.0	174.1	299.3	1 097.1	711.6	183.7
Rwanda	3.4	2.9	28.1	39.4	40.8	33.0	33.8	0.3	7.5	21.9	5.5	19.1	17.3
Saint Lucia	0.9	0.1	0.5	..	..	10.8	..	0.1	0.5	0.0	..	..	..
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1.4	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.9	0.0	0.0	..	..	..
Samoa	..	..	..	..	0.1	0.1	2.0	..	..	..	0.1	0.1	2.7
Sao Tome and Principe	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	0.6	..	..	..
Senegal	15.4	18.6	158.9	97.8	410.6	1 014.7	461.4	7.0	23.9	55.7	106.5	89.2	153.0
Serbia	23.4	200.4	924.8	583.2	711.7	212.0	541.1	12.8	603.8	412.2	575.8	561.4	370.6
Seychelles	..	..	12.0	2.5	11.4	5.1	5.0	..	5.1	4.7	2.5	16.4	6.7
Sierra Leone	..	..	7.6	8.4	..	45.7	129.5	..	..	17.2	..	18.3	0.3
Solomon Islands	..	..	1.4	4.9	2.5	2.6	72.1	..	1.4	1.9	2.5	2.6	2.1
Somalia	..	..	..	..	..	0.4	..	..	..	..	..	0.2	..
South Africa	143.4	178.0	2 698.5	306.6	260.4	853.6	81.7	22.3	980.4	1 167.1	587.9	645.2	812.3
South Sudan	..	..	..	1.1	..	2.2	..	..	..	0.3	2.4	..	1.0
Sri Lanka	125.3	236.7	159.0	179.7	488.9	636.8	488.2	9.1	122.1	190.6	210.2	302.2	250.4
Sudan	18.3	45.5	65.5	56.5	..	12.4	..	2.4	23.8	7.0	..	..	..
Suriname	5.6	1.4	13.8	59.3	..	130.5	49.3	..	23.6	43.2	30.7	78.4	6.6
Syrian Arab Republic	203.5	84.8	72.4	..	..	..	..	..	47.3	..	..	..	..
Tajikistan	..	..	18.2	51.2	176.3	74.1	94.8	..	16.8	12.1	71.5	23.0	22.9
Tanzania	6.1	18.1	8.2	99.6	563.9	181.3	47.9	15.0	10.0	27.7	31.3	44.4	122.2
Thailand	25.7	58.0	218.4	267.8	182.2	111.6	118.6	21.1	60.8	178.5	157.1	150.5	120.6
Timor-Leste	..	..	..	26.5	11.9	55.1	0.1	..	..	4.2	11.8	15.7	10.4
Togo	0.0	55.8	24.1	22.4	215.7	122.5	76.0	..	53.4	36.5	23.5	1.9	8.0
Tonga	..	..	..	..	2.2	2.4	0.9	..	..	..	2.2	2.4	0.9
Tunisia	317.3	507.8	846.1	345.1	1 203.5	648.1	1 121.9	203.1	608.7	289.3	690.9	482.8	818.7
Turkey	1 168.2	3 398.6	3 279.5	3 319.8	3 678.1	5 214.3	3 396.5	1 710.9	3 219.8	2 399.7	2 736.3	3 134.3	2 556.6
Turkmenistan	..	..	267.8	13.8	12.8	726.1	305.3	..	11.6	39.4	19.7	31.1	28.9
Tuvalu	..	..	..	..	0.2	0.2	0.1	..	..	..	0.2	0.2	0.1
Uganda	2.9	96.7	24.0	195.4	531.0	143.8	50.4	29.2	63.2	50.4	37.3	29.2	31.8

USD million (2017 constant)

Table A.20. Trade related other official flows by individual recipient country *(page 4 of 4)*

	COMMITMENTS							DISBURSEMENTS					
	2002-05 avg.	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017	2006-08 avg.	2009-011 avg.	2012-14 avg.	2015	2016	2017
Ukraine	58.6	421.0	1 438.0	1 616.0	2 385.0	553.0	713.8	197.3	1 140.4	1 239.5	1 310.9	1 065.4	441.4
Uruguay	234.3	136.2	216.9	615.3	782.5	170.8	409.0	63.7	186.9	191.7	186.1	101.4	314.1
Uzbekistan	123.7	93.8	368.8	1 113.7	792.4	386.2	526.4	29.9	61.3	406.2	729.3	394.0	272.7
Vanuatu	0.1	..	1.8	1.1	0.8	0.5	0.3	..	1.8	..	0.8	0.5	0.3
Venezuela	13.1	265.3	545.0	2.2	0.9	0.0	..	0.0	365.8	26.0	25.8	34.4	5.9
Viet Nam	27.9	736.5	1 592.1	1 635.3	1 455.3	1 431.3	1 531.6	215.8	779.1	1 493.9	1 920.3	1 293.3	1 641.6
Wallis and Futuna	0.0	..	..	..	..	14.8	..	..	..	..	..	7.4	2.1
West Bank and Gaza Strip	..	124.0	11.2	16.3	0.3	53.5	13.6	..	..	9.8	9.0	10.2	8.3
Yemen	..	164.2	11.1	15.4	..	..	..	180.1	32.8	0.4	..	..	..
Zambia	16.8	30.9	21.4	53.4	151.5	289.9	121.6	30.6	9.4	8.9	79.4	150.9	21.8
Zimbabwe	..	..	..	17.7	4.0	27.5	..	..	..	8.7	0.0	3.7	1.6
Total recipient countries	15 012.3	25 162.2	42 809.1	43 775.8	59 264.1	63 389.7	56 849.8	9 932.9	28 766.4	28 037.0	42 375.0	42 016.0	38 094.9
Non country specific	133.9	383.3	1 743.9	3 921.1	2 798.0	4 000.7	3 592.5	270.9	1 194.0	1 856.3	1 599.3	1 750.3	1 956.1
TOTAL TRADE-RELATED OOF	15 146.2	25 545.5	44 553.0	47 696.9	62 062.1	67 390.4	60 442.3	10 203.9	29 960.4	29 893.3	43 974.4	43 766.3	40 051.1

Source: OECD-DAC CRS: aid activity database (2019)

StatLink http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933962476

ANNEX B
DAC LIST OF ODA RECIPIENTS BY INCOME GROUP

LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Afghanistan
Angola
Bangladesh
Benin
Bhutan
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cambodia
Central African Republic
Chad
Comoros
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Djibouti
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Gambia
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Haiti
Kiribati
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Lesotho
Liberia
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Mauritania
Mozambique
Myanmar
Nepal
Niger
Rwanda
Sao Tome and Principe
Senegal
Sierra Leone
Solomon Islands
Somalia
South Sudan
Sudan
Tanzania
Timor-Leste
Togo
Tuvalu
Uganda
Vanuatu
Yemen
Zambia

OTHER LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES (GNI per capita <= $1 005 in 2016)

Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Zimbabwe

LOWER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES (GNI per capita <= $1 006 to $3 955 in 2016)

Armenia
Bolivia
Cabo Verde
Cameroon
Congo
Côte d'Ivoire
Egypt
Eswatini
El Salvador
Georgia
Ghana
Guatemala
Honduras
India
Indonesia
Jordan
Kenya
Kosovo[1]
Kyrgyzstan
Micronesia
Moldova
Mongolia
Morocco
Nicaragua
Nigeria
Pakistan
Papua New Guinea
Philippines
Sri Lanka
Syrian Arab Republic
Tajikistan
Tokelau*
Tunisia
Ukraine
Uzbekistan
Viet Nam
West Bank and Gaza Strip

UPPER MIDDLE-INCOME COUNTRIES (GNI per capita <= $3 956 to $12 235 in 2016)

Albania
Algeria
Antigua and Barbuda
Argentina
Azerbaijan
Belarus
Belize
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Botswana
Brazil
People's Republic of China
Colombia
Cook Islands
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominica
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Equatorial Guinea
Fiji
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Gabon
Grenada
Guyana
Iran
Iraq
Jamaica
Kazakhstan
Lebanon
Libya
Malaysia
Maldives
Marshall Islands
Mauritius
Mexico
Montenegro
Montserrat*
Namibia
Nauru
Niue
Palau
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Saint Helen*
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Samoa
Serbia
South Africa
Suriname
Thailand
Tonga
Turkey
Turkmenistan
Venezuela
Wallis and Futuna*

Notes:

* Territory

1. This is without prejudice to the status of Kosovo under international law.

ANNEX C
DAC LIST OF ODA-ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES BY REGION

AFRICA

North of Sahara

Algeria
Egypt
Libya
Morocco
Tunisia

South of Sahara

Angola
Benin
Botswana
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cabo Verde
Cameroon
Central African Republic
Chad
Comoros
Congo
Côte d'Ivoire
Democratic Republic of the Congo
Djibouti
Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Gabon
Gambia
Ghana
Guinea
Guinea-Bissau
Kenya
Lesotho
Liberia
Madagascar
Malawi
Mali
Mauritania
Mauritius
Mozambique
Namibia
Niger
Nigeria
Rwanda
Saint Helena
Sao Tome and Principe
Senegal
Sierra Leone
Somalia
South Africa
South Sudan
Sudan
Eswatini
Tanzania
Togo
Uganda
Zambia
Zimbabwe

AMERICA

North & Central America

Antigua and Barbuda
Belize
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominica
Dominican Republic
El Salvador
Grenada
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Jamaica
Mexico
Montserrat
Nicaragua
Panama
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
West Indies, regional

South America

Argentina
Bolivia
Brazil
Colombia
Ecuador
Guyana
Paraguay
Peru
Suriname
Venezuela

ASIA

South & Central Asia

Afghanistan
Armenia
Azerbaijan
Bangladesh
Bhutan
Georgia
India
Kazakhstan
Kyrgyzstan
Maldives
Myanmar
Nepal
Pakistan
Sri Lanka
Tajikistan
Turkmenistan
Uzbekistan

Middle East

Iran
Iraq
Jordan
Lebanon
Syrian Arab Republic
West Bank and Gaza Strip
Yemen

Far East

Cambodia
China (People's Republic of)
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Indonesia
Lao People's Democratic Republic
Malaysia
Mongolia
Philippines
Thailand
Timor-Leste
Viet Nam

EUROPE

Albania
Belarus
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Kosovo
Moldova
Montenegro
Serbia
Turkey
Ukraine

OCEANIA

Cook Islands
Fiji
Kiribati
Marshall Islands
Micronesia
Nauru
Niue
Palau
Papua New Guinea
Samoa
Solomon Islands
Tokelau
Tonga
Tuvalu
Vanuatu
Wallis and Futuna

ANNEX D
AID FOR TRADE: SECTORS AND DEFINITIONS

CRS PURPOSE CODE	DESCRIPTION	CLARIFICATIONS / ADDITIONAL NOTES ON COVERAGE
Trade policy and regulations and trade-related adjustment		
33110	Trade policy and administrative management	Trade policy and planning; support to ministries and departments responsible for trade policy; trade-related legislation and regulatory reforms; policy analysis and implementation of multilateral trade agreements e.g. technical barriers to trade and sanitary and phytosanitary measures (TBT/SPS) except at regional level (see 33130); mainstreaming trade in national development strategies (e.g. poverty reduction strategy papers); wholesale/retail trade; unspecified trade and trade promotion activities.
33120	Trade facilitation	Simplification and harmonisation of international import and export procedures (e.g. customs valuation, licensing procedures, transport formalities, payments, insurance); support to customs departments and other border agencies including in particular implementation of the provisions of the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement; tariff reforms.
33130	Regional trade agreements (RTAs)	Support to regional trade arrangements [e.g. Southern African Development Community (SADC), Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), African Caribbean Pacific/European Union (ACP/EU)], including work on technical barriers to trade and sanitary and phytosanitary measures (TBT/SPS) at regional level; elaboration of rules of origin and introduction of special and differential treatment in RTAs.
33140	Multilateral trade negotiations	Support developing countries' effective participation in multilateral trade negotiations, including training of negotiators, assessing impacts of negotiations; accession to the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and other multilateral trade-related organisations.
33181	Trade education/training	Human resources development in trade not included under any of the above codes. Includes university programmes in trade.
33150	Trade-related adjustment	Contributions to the government budget to assist the implementation of recipients' own trade reforms and adjustments to trade policy measures by other countries; assistance to manage shortfalls in the balance of payments due to changes in the world trading environment.
Economic infrastructure		
	TRANSPORT AND STORAGE	Note: Manufacturing of transport equipment should be included under code 32172.
21010	Transport policy and administrative management	Transport sector policy, planning and programmes; aid to transport ministries; institution capacity building and advice; unspecified transport; activities that combine road, rail, water and/or air transport.
21020	Road transport	Road infrastructure, road vehicles; passenger road transport, motor passenger cars.

21030	Rail transport	Rail infrastructure, rail equipment, locomotives, other rolling stock; including light rail (tram) and underground systems.
21040	Water transport	Harbours and docks, harbour guidance systems, ships and boats; river and other inland water transport, inland barges and vessels.
21050	Air transport	Airports, airport guidance systems, aeroplanes, aeroplane maintenance equipment.
21061	Storage	Whether or not related to transportation.
21081	Education and training in transport and storage	
	COMMUNICATIONS	
22010	Communications policy and administrative management	Communications sector policy, planning and programmes; institution capacity building and advice; including postal services development; unspecified communications activities.
22020	Telecommunications	Telephone networks, telecommunication satellites, earth stations.
22030	Radio/television/print media	Radio and TV links, equipment; newspapers; printing and publishing.
22040	Information and communication technology (ICT)	Computer hardware and software; internet access; IT training. When sector cannot be specified.
	ENERGY GENERATION AND SUPPLY	
23110	Energy policy and administrative management	Energy sector policy, planning; aid to energy ministries; institution capacity building and advice; unspecified energy activities.
23111	Energy sector policy, planning and administration	
23112	Energy regulation	Regulation of the energy sector, including wholesale and retail electricity provision.
23181	Energy education/training	All levels of training not included elsewhere.
23182	Energy research	Including general inventories, surveys.
23183	Energy conservation and demand-side efficiency	All projects in support of energy demand reduction, e.g. building and industry upgrades, smart grids, metering and tariffs. Also includes efficient cook-stoves and biogas projects.
23210	Energy generation, renewable sources - multiple technologies	Renewable energy generation programmes that cannot be attributed to one single technology (codes 23220 through 23280 below). Fuelwood/ charcoal production should be included under forestry 31261.
23220	Hydro-electric power plants	Including energy generating river barges.
23230	Solar energy	Including photo-voltaic cells, solar thermal applications and solar heating.
23240	Wind energy	Wind energy for water lifting and electric power generation.
23250	Marine energy	Including ocean thermal energy conversion, tidal and wave power.
23260	Geothermal energy	Use of geothermal energy for generating electric power or directly as heat for agriculture, etc.

23270	Biofuel-fired power plants	Use of solids and liquids produced from biomass for direct power generation. Also includes biogases from anaerobic fermentation (e.g. landfill gas, sewage sludge gas, fermentation of energy crops and manure) and thermal processes (also known as syngas); waste-fired power plants making use of biodegradable municipal waste (household waste and waste from companies and public services that resembles household waste, collected at installations specifically designed for their disposal with recovery of combustible liquids, gases or heat). See code 23360 for non- renewable waste-fired power plants.
23310	Energy generation, non-renewable sources, unspecified	Thermal power plants including when energy source cannot be determined; combined gas-coal power plants.
23320	Coal-fired electric power plants	Thermal electric power plants that use coal as the energy source.
23330	Oil-fired electric power plants	Thermal electric power plants that use fuel oil or diesel fuel as the energy source.
23340	Natural gas-fired electric power plants	Electric power plants that are fuelled by natural gas.
23350	Fossil fuel electric power plants with carbon capture and storage (CCS)	Fossil fuel electric power plants employing technologies to capture carbon dioxide emissions. CCS not related to power plants should be included under 41020. CCS activities are not reportable as ODA.
23360	Non-renewable waste-fired electric power plants	Electric power plants that use non-biodegradable industrial and municipal waste as the energy source.
23410	Hybrid energy electric power plants	Electric power plants that make use of both non-renewable and renewable energy sources.
23510	Nuclear energy electric power plants	Including nuclear safety.
23610	Heat plants	Power plants which are designed to produce heat only.
23620	District heating and cooling	Distribution of heat generated in a centralised location, or delivery of chilled water, for residential and commercial heating or cooling purposes.
23630	Electric power transmission and distribution	Grid distribution from power source to end user; transmission lines. Also includes storage of energy to generate power (e.g. pumped hydro, batteries) and the extension of grid access, often to rural areas.
23640	Gas distribution	Delivery for use by ultimate consumer.
Building productive capacity (the following codes relate to the trade development marker)		
	BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES	
24010	Financial policy and administrative management	Finance sector policy, planning and programmes; institution capacity building and advice; financial markets and systems.
24020	Monetary institutions	Central banks.
24030	Formal sector financial intermediaries	All formal sector financial intermediaries; credit lines; insurance, leasing, venture capital, etc. (except when focused on only one sector).
24040	Informal/semi-formal financial intermediaries	Micro credit, savings and credit co-operatives etc.

24050	Remittance facilitation, promotion and optimisation	
24081	Education/training in banking and financial services	
	BUSINESS AND OTHER SERVICES	
25010	Business support services and institutions	Support to trade and business associations, chambers of commerce; legal and regulatory reform aimed at improving business and investment climate; private sector institution capacity building and advice; trade information; public-private sector networking including trade fairs; e-commerce. Where sector cannot be specified: general support to private sector enterprises (in particular, use code 32130 for enterprises in the industrial sector).
25020	Privatisation	When sector cannot be specified. Including general state enterprise restructuring or demonopolisation programmes; planning, programming, advice.
25030	Business development services	Public and private provision of business development services, e.g. incubators, business strategies, commercial linkages programmes and matchmaking services. Includes support to private organisations representing businesses, e.g. business associations; chambers of commerce; producer associations; providers of know-how and other business development services. For financial services use CRS codes 24030 or 24040. For SME development and for support to companies in the industrial sector use codes 32130 through 32172. For support to companies in the agricultural sector use code 31120.
25040	Responsible Business Conduct	Support to policy reform, implementation and enforcement of responsible business conduct (RBC) principles and standards as well as facilitation of responsible business practices by companies. Includes establishing and enforcing a legal and regulatory framework to protect stakeholder rights and the environment, rewarding best performers; exemplifying RBC in government economic activities, such as state-owned enterprises' operations or public procurement; support to the implementation of the OECD Guidelines for MNEs, including disclosure, human rights, employment and industrial relations, environment, combating bribery, consumer interests, science and technology, competition and taxation.
	AGRICULTURE	
31110	Agricultural policy and administrative management	Agricultural sector policy, planning and programmes; aid to agricultural ministries; institution capacity building and advice; unspecified agriculture.
31120	Agricultural development	Integrated projects; farm development.
31130	Agricultural land resources	Including soil degradation control; soil improvement; drainage of water logged areas; soil desalination; agricultural land surveys; land reclamation; erosion control, desertification control.
31140	Agricultural water resources	Irrigation, reservoirs, hydraulic structures, ground water exploitation for agricultural use.
31150	Agricultural inputs	Supply of seeds, fertilizers, agricultural machinery/equipment.

31161	Food crop production	Including grains (wheat, rice, barley, maize, rye, oats, millet, sorghum); horticulture; vegetables; fruit and berries; other annual and perennial crops. [Use code 32161 for agro-industries.]
31162	Industrial crops/export crops	Including sugar; coffee, cocoa, tea; oil seeds, nuts, kernels; fibre crops; tobacco; rubber. [Use code 32161 for agro-industries.]
31163	Livestock	Animal husbandry; animal feed aid.
31164	Agrarian reform	Including agricultural sector adjustment.
31165	Agricultural alternative development	Projects to reduce illicit drug cultivation through other agricultural marketing and production opportunities (see code 43050 for non-agricultural alternative development).
31166	Agricultural extension	Non-formal training in agriculture.
31181	Agricultural education/training	
31182	Agricultural research	Plant breeding, physiology, genetic resources, ecology, taxonomy, disease control, agricultural bio-technology; including livestock research (animal health, breeding and genetics, nutrition, physiology).
31191	Agricultural services	Marketing policies & organisation; storage and transportation, creation of strategic reserves.
31192	Plant and post-harvest protection and pest control	Including integrated plant protection, biological plant protection activities, supply and management of agrochemicals, supply of pesticides, plant protection policy and legislation.
31193	Agricultural financial services	Financial intermediaries for the agricultural sector including credit schemes; crop insurance.
31194	Agricultural co-operatives	Including farmers' organisations.
31195	Livestock/veterinary services	Animal health and management, genetic resources, feed resources.
	FORESTRY	
31210	Forestry policy and administrative management	Forestry sector policy, planning and programmes; institution capacity building and advice; forest surveys; unspecified forestry and agro-forestry activities.
31220	Forestry development	Afforestation for industrial and rural consumption; exploitation and utilisation; erosion control, desertification control; integrated forestry projects.
31261	Fuelwood/charcoal	Forestry development whose primary purpose is production of fuelwood and charcoal.
31281	Forestry education/training	
31282	Forestry research	Including artificial regeneration, genetic improvement, production methods, fertilizer, harvesting.
31291	Forestry services	

	FISHING	
31310	Fishing policy and administrative management	Fishing sector policy, planning and programmes; institution capacity building and advice; ocean and coastal fishing; marine and freshwater fish surveys and prospecting; fishing boats/equipment; unspecified fishing activities.
31320	Fishery development	Exploitation and utilisation of fisheries; fish stock protection; aquaculture; integrated fishery projects.
31381	Fishery education/training	
31382	Fishery research	Pilot fish culture; marine/freshwater biological research.
31391	Fishery services	Fishing harbours; fish markets; fishery transport and cold storage.
	INDUSTRY	
32110	Industrial policy and administrative management	Industrial sector policy, planning and programmes; institution capacity building and advice; unspecified industrial activities; manufacturing of goods not specified below.
32120	Industrial development	
32130	Small and medium-sized enterprises (SME) development	Direct support to the development of small and medium-sized enterprises in the industrial sector, including accounting, auditing and advisory services.
32140	Cottage industries and handicraft	
32161	Agro-industries	Staple food processing, dairy products, slaughter houses and equipment, meat and fish processing and preserving, oils/fats, sugar refineries, beverages/tobacco, animal feeds production.
32162	Forest industries	Wood production, pulp/paper production.
32163	Textiles, leather and substitutes	Including knitting factories.
32164	Chemicals	Industrial and non-industrial production facilities; includes pesticides production.
32165	Fertilizer plants	
32166	Cement/lime/plaster	
32167	Energy manufacturing	Including gas liquefaction; petroleum refineries.
32168	Pharmaceutical production	Medical equipment/supplies; drugs, medicines, vaccines; hygienic products.
32169	Basic metal industries	Iron and steel, structural metal production.
32170	Non-ferrous metal industries	
32171	Engineering	Manufacturing of electrical and non-electrical machinery, engines/ turbines.
32172	Transport equipment industry	Shipbuilding, fishing boats building; railroad equipment; motor vehicles and motor passenger cars; aircraft; navigation/guidance systems.
32182	Technological research and development	Including industrial standards; quality management; metrology; testing; accreditation; certification.

	MINERAL RESOURCES AND MINING	
32210	Mineral/mining policy and administrative management	Mineral and mining sector policy, planning and programmes; mining legislation, mining cadastre, mineral resources inventory, information systems, institution capacity building and advice; unspecified mineral resources exploitation.
32220	Mineral prospection and exploration	Geology, geophysics, geochemistry; excluding hydrogeology (14010) and environmental geology (41010), mineral extraction and processing, infrastructure, technology, economics, safety and environment management.
32261	Coal	Including lignite and peat.
32262	Oil and gas	Petroleum, natural gas, condensates, liquefied petroleum gas (LPG), liquefied natural gas (LNG); including drilling and production.
32263	Ferrous metals	Iron and ferro-alloy metals.
32264	Nonferrous metals	Aluminium, copper, lead, nickel, tin, zinc.
32265	Precious metals/materials	Gold, silver, platinum, diamonds, gemstones.
32266	Industrial minerals	Baryte, limestone, feldspar, kaolin, sand, gypsym, gravel, ornamental stones.
32267	Fertilizer minerals	Phosphates, potash.
32268	Offshore minerals	Polymetallic nodules, phosphorites, marine placer deposits.
	TOURISM	
33210	Tourism policy and administrative management	

ENHANCED INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK

The EIF is a global partnership that is dedicated to supporting the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) to use trade as a tool for economic growth and poverty reduction through job and income opportunities. The EIF empowers LDCs to identify where and how trade can form an integral part of their national development strategies and assist them in harnessing Aid for Trade towards this objective.

The EIF provides country specific and customized support that addresses the full suite of trade capacity building needs. Through building trade capacity, the partnership works together to support the LDCs' own drive to:

- identify and address the priority constraints to trade;
- ensure trade directly supports the national development agenda;
- set up institutional and coordination mechanisms for trade related technical assistance;
- initiate policy reform and mobilize additional financial and technical resources to address priority trade needs.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE CENTRE

ITC is a multilateral agency fully dedicated to developing the international competitiveness of SMEs. As a joint agency of WTO and UN, ITC focuses on small business export success. ITC works especially in least developed countries, land-locked developing countries, fragile and post-conflict countries, Small Island Developing States and sub-Saharan Africa. We help to build vibrant, sustainable export sectors that provide entrepreneurial opportunities, particularly for women, young people and poor communities.

Focus areas for SME competitiveness include:

- Developing trade and market intelligence
- Building a conducive business environment
- Strengthening trade and investment support institutions
- Connecting to value chains
- Supporting regional integration and South-South linkages
- Mainstreaming inclusive and green trade

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

UNCTAD, which is governed by its 194 member States, is the United Nations body responsible for dealing with development issues, particularly international trade – the main driver of development. Its work can be summed up in three words: think, debate, and deliver. Reflection on development is at the heart of UNCTAD's work. It produces analyses that form the basis for recommendations to policymakers. UNCTAD is also a forum where representatives of all countries can freely engage in dialogue and discuss ways to establish a better balance in the global economy. In addition, UNCTAD offers direct technical assistance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition, helping them to build the capacities they need to become equitably integrated into the global economy and improve the well-being of their populations.

UNCTAD holds a ministerial-level meeting every four years to discuss major global economic issues and to decide on its programme of work. Every two years, UNCTAD organizes the World Investment Forum, which brings together major players from the international investment community to discuss challenges and opportunities and to promote investment policies and partnerships for sustainable development and equitable growth.

UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

UNIDO is the specialized agency of the United Nations that promotes industrial development for poverty reduction, inclusive globalization and environmental sustainability. As of 1 April 2019, 170 States are Members of UNIDO. They regularly discuss and decide UNIDO's guiding principles and policies in the sessions of the Policymaking Organs. The mission of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), as described in the Lima Declaration adopted at the fifteenth session of the UNIDO General Conference in 2013, is to promote and accelerate inclusive and sustainable industrial development in Member States.

The Organization's programmatic focus is structured, in four strategic priorities:

- Creating shared prosperity
- Advancing economic competitiveness
- Safeguarding the environment
- Strengthening knowledge and institutions

WORLD BANK GROUP

The World Bank Group has set two goals for the world to achieve by 2030: end extreme poverty by decreasing the percentage of people living on less than $1.25 a day to no more than 3%; and promote shared prosperity by fostering the income growth of the bottom 40% for every country. In the area of trade and competitiveness, the World Bank Group helps countries achieve these two goals through rapid and broad-based economic growth, centred on strong contributions from the private sector. The World Bank Group is working in this area to help countries expand the volume and value of trade, enhance the investment climate, improve competitiveness in sectors, and foster innovation and entrepreneurship.

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only global organisation dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the bulk of the world's trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The goal is to help producers of goods and services, exporters, and importers conduct their business.

The WTO's main activities are to:

- negotiate the reduction or elimination of obstacles to trade (import tariffs, other barriers to trade) and agreeing on rules governing the conduct of international trade (e.g. antidumping, subsidies, product standards, etc.)
- administer and monitor the application of the WTO's agreed rules for trade in goods, trade in services, and trade-related intellectual property rights
- monitor and review the trade policies of its members, as well as to ensure transparency of regional and bilateral trade agreements
- settle disputes among its members regarding the interpretation and application of the agreements
- build capacity of developing country government officials in international trade matters
- assist the process of accession of some 30 countries who are not yet members of the organization
- conduct economic research and collecting and disseminating trade data in support of the WTO's other main activities
- explain to and educate the public about the WTO, its mission and its activities.

The WTO currently has 164 members, with more than two-thirds developing economies or separate customs territories.

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The OECD is a unique forum where governments work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help governments respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The Organisation provides a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice and work to co-ordinate domestic and international policies.

The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The European Union takes part in the work of the OECD. OECD Publishing disseminates widely the results of the Organisation's statistics gathering and research on economic, social and environmental issues, as well as the conventions, guidelines and standards agreed by its members.

AID FOR TRADE
Global Review
3-5 July **2019**

AIDFORTRADE AT A GLANCE 2019

ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND EMPOWERMENT

Aid for Trade at a Glance 2019 analyses how trade can contribute to economic diversification and empowerment, with a focus on eliminating extreme poverty, particularly through the effective participation of women and youth, and how aid for trade can contribute to those objectives by addressing supply-side capacity and trade-related infrastructure constraints, including for Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises notably in rural areas.

The analysis is based on the views of 133 respondents – 88 developing countries, 35 donors, 5 providers of South-South trade-related support and 5 regional organisations – who participated in the 2019 aid-for-trade monitoring and evaluation exercise. They share the view that economic diversification is a gateway for economic empowerment, but also that empowerment is essential for economic diversification particularly when it enables youth, women and Micro, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises to engage in international trade.

Overview		*Contributed by*
Chapter 1	Setting the Scene	WTO
Chapter 2	Aid for Trade, Economic Diversification and Empowerment	OECD
Chapter 3	Economic Diversification through Industrialisation	UNIDO
Chapter 4	Aid for Trade in Challenging Contexts	UNDP and EIF
Chapter 5	Economic Diversification: Lessons from Practice	WBG
Chapter 6	The Critical Role of Trade Facilitation	WB, OECD, and UNCTAD
Chapter 7	Export Diversification at the Time of Slowbalisation	UNCTAD
Chapter 8	Empowering Youth for Sustainable Trade	ITC
Chapter 9	Supporting Women's Economic Empowerment	OECD

Consult the full publication on line at ***https://doi.org/10.1787/18ea27d8-en***.
This work is published on the OECD iLibrary, which gathers all OECD books, periodicals and statistical databases.
Visit ***www.oecd-ilibrary.org*** for more information.

www.aid4trade.org

OECD*publishing*
www.oecd.org/publishing

978-92-64-40293-5