

DONOR QUESTIONNAIRE ON AID FOR TRADE

This questionnaire is intended to solicit information about the progress made since the 2008 self assessment. It focuses in particular on the outcomes of aid-for-trade strategies and programmes to further knowledge sharing among stakeholders.

For further details or additional forms please visit www.oecd.org/dac/aft/questionnaire or contact the secretariats of the OECD (aft.monitoring@oecd.org) or the WTO (aft.monitoring@wto.org).

COUNTRY: EU

A. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY					
1. HAS YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY CHANGED SINCE 2008?					
YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE <input type="checkbox"/>		
1.1 If YES, please rate the importance of each of the following changes?					
Greater focus on:	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE
• Economic growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Poverty reduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Climate change and green growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Gender equality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Regional integration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Monitoring and evaluating results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Different geographic focus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please specify:</i>					
Different thematic focus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please specify:</i>					
Phasing out of aid for trade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please specify:</i>					
1.2 If YES, please rate the importance of the following driving forces behind these changes:					
	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE
The economic crisis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Changed priorities in the development strategies of partner countries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Changed priorities in the development strategies of regional bodies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Change of national government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Changes in bilateral trade and investment relations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Changed priorities in your development cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
New research, approaches, or aid instruments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More focus on triangular co-operation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please specify:</i>					
2. LOOKING AHEAD TO 2013, IS YOUR GOVERNMENT PLANNING ANY CHANGES TO ITS AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?					
YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE <input type="checkbox"/>		
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance of the changes your government is planning:					
Greater focus on:	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE
Economic growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poverty reduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Climate change and green growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gender equality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regional integration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Monitoring and evaluating results	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Different geographic focus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please specify:</i>					
Different thematic focus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please specify:</i>					
Phasing out of aid for trade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please specify: The EU is currently reviewing its overarching development cooperation policy, as well as its policies relating to trade and development, and private sector and growth. This may have implications for the EU AFT Strategy.</i>					

B. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE FINANCING				
DEMAND				
3. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FROM YOUR PARTNER COUNTRIES CHANGED SINCE 2008?				
SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED <input type="checkbox"/>	INCREASED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LITTLE/NO CHANGE <input type="checkbox"/>	DECLINED <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3.1 <i>If the demand increased, please describe from which countries and for which type of aid for trade: Overall increased. Significantly increased in the following countries: Benin, Cameroun, Colombia, Nigeria, Seychelles, Ukraine, West Bank – Gaza, Yemen, Zimbabwe. Increased in: Bangladesh, Barbados and the Members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) - Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Burundi, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Djibouti, Georgia, Guatemala, Haïti, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua and Central American Region, Niger, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand and Uganda. In other countries little or no change: Angola, Argentina, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Comoros, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, India, Kazakhstan, Mali, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, SADC, Syria, Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisie, Venezuela, Vietnam.</i></p>				
4. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FOR REGIONAL INTEGRATION PROGRAMMES CHANGED SINCE 2008?				
SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED <input type="checkbox"/>	INCREASED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LITTLE/NO CHANGE <input type="checkbox"/>	DECLINED <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4.1 <i>If the demand increased, please describe from which regions and for which type of aid for trade: The EU gives specific regional level support to regional integration for the ACP countries. The allocation for the period 2008 to 2013 is € 1.783 billion, of which around 70 % is for economic integration. The level of demand is similar to the situation in 2008. Please note also that out of 89 EU delegation in the world (also non ACP), 62 report that they have supported the partner country in strengthening the inclusion of strategic regional integration priorities (relevant to Aid for Trade) in the national development plan, or the trade strategy. 57 out of 89 report that this is an improvement as compared to 2008. This would seem to suggest an increase in demand for this type of support.</i></p>				
RESOURCES				
5. HAVE YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE RESOURCES INCREASED SINCE 2008?				
YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>		
6. DOES YOUR AGENCY HAVE INDICATIVE FORWARD SPENDING PLANS?				
YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>		
6.1. If YES, do these forward spending plans include estimates for aid for trade?				
YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>		

6.2 If YES, please specify these estimates: The EC does not have sector specific financial plans for AfT, but generally operates on the basis of multi-annual national and regional Programming documents based on priorities expressed by partner countries. In these, Trade, Private Sector, Regional integration, Infrastructure and Agriculture etc can occur as main areas of cooperation, or, alternatively, trade related issues can be embedded in other focal sectors – trade facilitation in transport, SPS measures in rural development etc. The programming documents do however not identify in advance the specific AfT categories in which programmes may fall (CRS codes are not used at this stage). Furthermore, programming documents for different financing instruments cover different year spans and do not allow to consolidate figures on the basis of a yearly spending plan.

For instance, for the ACP countries a total of €22.7 billion is set aside for the period 2008-2013, and of this between €4 and €5 billion of the allocations at national level will fall in an AfT category; a total of €1.78 bn is made available in support of ACP integration efforts at regional level; and a total of around €1.16 billion concerns the AfT agenda at "all-ACP" (multiregion) level. For Latin America, Asia and the Mediterranean and neighbourhood countries, multiannual programming is also applied.

Please note also in relation to resources, that the EU Trade Related Assistance in 2009 amounted to € 864.8 million. In addition to what is classified as TPR and TD, this includes programmes supporting "other trade related needs" to a value of €332 million .

C. IMPLEMENTING YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY

7. IN HOW MANY OF YOUR POLICY DIALOGUES IS TRADE NOW A REGULAR TOPIC OF DISCUSSION?

	> 75%	75% - 50%	50% - 25%	< 25%	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
With partner countries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With regional communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. IS THIS AN IMPROVEMENT COMPARED TO 2008?

	SIGNIFICANT	MODERATE	LITTLE/NONE	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
With partner countries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With regional communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. IS THE PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVED IN YOUR DIALOGUE?

	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	NOT SURE
With partner countries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With regional communities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9.1 Please describe and provide examples of your experience in dialogues that involve the private sector: .

In general, consultations take place during the programme identification and design phases. The private sector is involved in constructive dialogues to determine the needs of the partner country and to identify key interlocutors. For instance, in 2009-2010, a Burkina Faso Transport sector Programme, the EU Institutions dialogued with stakeholders including transport companies, private industries, and met with individual transporters and Unions in order to address the transport facilitation constraints caused by systematic overloading of trucks along the main corridors. The consultations provided a final agreement to focus on enforcement and, in 2010, they measured their results in a second stakeholder workshop which allowed significant progress: a realistic standard for long distance oil transport, and a bonus granted to containerised transport. programme.

It should be noted that whilst preparation and implementation of aid programmes can help facilitate the inclusion of private and civil society stakeholders in national policy debate, the overall responsibility for this lies with the partner country government. More can be done to put in place and use effective platforms for such dialogue.

10. IS CIVIL SOCIETY INVOLVED IN YOUR DIALOGUE?

	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	NOT SURE
With partner countries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With regional communities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10.1 Please describe and provide examples of your experience in dialogues that involve civil society: *In general, consultations take place during the programme identification and design phases. The EU Institutions support the involvement of the civil society in various ways. As an example, it has financed a Trade Capacity Building Project (TCBP) for Non-State Actors (NSA) in Zimbabwe (2006-2010). This project, with a budget of more than 1M€, seeks to build the capacity of non state actors to influence trade policy and trade negotiating outcomes improving their knowledge and understanding of trade related issues. It also aims at ensuring that their interests are adequately accommodated during the EPA negotiations processes, as well as ensuring that the business sector in Zimbabwe is adequately prepared to compete in a liberalised trading environment and therefore able, not only to regain lost markets, but also to create new and better opportunities. Stakeholder consultations were undertaken specifically for the formulation of the project. There were visits to key NSA and companies for an onsite assessment of their activities in the country's two major cities, Harare and Bulawayo. The consultative process culminated in a key stakeholder workshop in Harare to facilitate wider consultations of stakeholders on the ideal intervention strategy. Participants included business associations, NGOs, academic institutions, private companies, individuals and the Ministry of Industry and International Trade (MITT).*

11. ARE YOU HARMONISING YOUR STRATEGY WITH OTHER DONORS BETTER NOW THAN YOU WERE BEFORE 2008?

SIGNIFICANTLY MODERATELY RARELY/NEVER NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE

11.1 If you are harmonising better, how often do you use the following approaches?

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

Joint implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Common monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please specify:

12. HAS ALIGNMENT OF YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE PROGRAMME IMPROVED SINCE 2008?

	SIGNIFICANT	MODERATE	LITTLE/ NONE	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
With partner country priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With the Enhanced integrated Framework	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
With regional priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please elaborate with examples: Overall, EU aid for trade was already well aligned with partner country and regional organisations priorities in 2008, this is still the case.

12.1. How many of your aid-for-trade programmes are aligned around trade priorities of?

	> 75%	75% - 50%	50% - 25%	< 25%	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
Partner countries' development strategies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The DTIS Action Matrix (for LDCs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regional organisations development strategies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

SIGNIFICANTLY MODERATELY RARELY/NEVER NOT SURE

13.1 If there have been improvements, how often do you:

	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	NOT SURE
Use your own monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rely on partner countries' monitoring processes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use joint monitoring arrangements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13.2 Please provide examples and describe your experience with monitoring your aid-for-trade programmes: The EC distinguishes between strategy, programme and project evaluations. The main purposes of project evaluations are to contribute to the design of interventions, to assist in an efficient allocation of resources, to improve the quality of the intervention and to report on the achievements. The methodology departs from an analysis of the project rationale and intervention logic at its outset and uses the categories of efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and coherence, impact and sustainability as well as the EC value added to measure and conclude on the success, recommend adaptations and draw lessons for the future. Evaluations are carried out during mid-term and end of programmes where appropriate. The evaluations are tailored to the context and type of AfT operation.

Furthermore, the Commission carries out specific evaluations of cooperation by country and by region, as well as by theme - a series of AfT related thematic evaluations are presently underway or planned.

In addition, eAll EC programmes, including the AfT ones, are subject to a monitoring system called Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM). The ROM system of the EC was established in 2000 in order to provide external, objective and impartial feedback on the performance of aid projects and programmes financed by the EC.

ROM is part of the overall quality assurance cycle of EuropeAid, which starts during the design of projects and ends after its implementation. Quality assurance mechanisms (design checks, monitoring and evaluations) are in place to ensure that projects are relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries, and are well performing.

Thanks to its highly structured, coherent methodology, ROM provides benefits on three levels:

- at the micro level of a project or programme: ROM gives feedback to project managers on the performance of the operations under their responsibility and gives recommendations on how to improve them, if necessary.**
- at the macro level of general EuropeAid policy articulation, implementation and review: ROM provides a statistical overview of the performance of the EC development aid portfolio with data comparable over time, across regions, between sectors etc.**
- at the level of programming and learning: Quantitative and qualitative studies based on ROM data contribute lessons learned and best practices to the programming and planning of new projects.**

ROM provides an external, neutral viewpoint on the project progress and takes into account in particular the opinion of beneficiaries. Results-Oriented Monitoring system is applied all regions of External Cooperation and aims to include all operations with a budget above €1M.

D. IS YOUR AID FOR TRADE WORKING?

14. DOES YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY DEFINE CLEAR OBJECTIVES?

YES

NO

NOT SURE

NOT APPLICABLE

14.1 If YES, what are the objectives of your aid-for-trade strategy?

	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT
Enhanced understanding of the role of trade in economic development (awareness)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased trade profile (mainstreaming)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Larger aid-for-trade flows	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Increased exports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Increased trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Export diversification	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Increased economic growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Reduced poverty	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Greater environmental sustainability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Greater gender equality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Please specify:</i> The overall objective of the EU and EU MS Aid for Trade Strategy is to support all developing countries, particularly Least Developed Countries (LDCs), to better integrate into the rules-based world trading system and to more effectively use trade in promoting the overarching objective of eradication of poverty in the context of sustainable development					
15. WHAT IS THE SHARE OF YOUR AID FOR TRADE PROGRAMMES THAT CONTAIN QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?					
> 75% <input type="checkbox"/>	75% - 50% <input type="checkbox"/>	50% - 25% <input type="checkbox"/>	< 25% <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE <input type="checkbox"/>
16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVALUATED ITS AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY, PROGRAMMES OR PROJECTS?					
	YES	NO	NOT SURE		
Overall strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Programmes and projects	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Both	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
16.1 If YES, please provide a copy of the(se) evaluation(s) when submitting this questionnaire.					
16.2 If NO, is your government planning an evaluation of its:					
	YES	NO	NOT SURE		
Overall strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Programmes and projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Both	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
16.3 If YES, for which year is the evaluation planned?					
	2010	2011	2012	2013	
Overall strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Programmes and projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Both	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

17. PLEASE RATE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING CHALLENGES IN EVALUATING YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY, PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS:

	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT
Difficulty in identifying quantifiable objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Difficulty in obtaining in-country data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Absence of suitable indicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Budgetary constraints	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ability of in-country staff to collect and report data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ability of project partners to collect and report data	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Difficulty of assigning trade outcomes to the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Difficulty in identifying quantifiable objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. ARE THERE ANY PARTICULAR EXAMPLES OF YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE PROCESSES, PROGRAMMES OR PROJECTS THAT HAVE OBTAINED GOOD RESULTS THAT YOU THINK COULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOOD PRACTICES?

Please list and describe: **PLEASE SEE THE CASE STORIES.**

19. DOES YOUR GOVERNMENT CONSIDER IT USEFUL TO MONITOR AID FOR TRADE AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL?

VERY USEFUL

USEFUL

NOT USEFUL

NOT SURE

20. WHAT DO YOU SEE AS MAJOR CHALLENGES OR AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN MONITORING AID FOR TRADE AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL?

Please describe and provide examples: **AS MENTIONED EARLIER, THE EU ATTACHES GREAT IMPORTANCE TO MONITORING OF ITS AID FOR TRADE. IT SEES VALUE IN EXCHANGING EXPERIENCES AMONG PARTNER COUNTRIES AND OTHER DONORS IN THIS REGARD, AND ALSO IN WORKING TOGETHER TO DEFINE AND EXTEND THE USE OF OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS FOR RESULTS AND IMPACTS. SIMILARLY, IT IS INTERESTED IN EXCHANGING EXPERIENCE ON THE IMPACT THAT DIFFERENT POLICIES HAVE HAD ON TRADE IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES AND SITUATIONS. THIS SAID, IT CONSIDERS THAT THE MAIN EFFORTS IN RELATION TO MONITORING STILL NEED TO BE PLACED ON SUPPORTING DEVELOPING PARTNER COUNTRIES' OWN CAPACITY TO MONITOR AND DRAW RELEVANT POLICY CONCLUSIONS OF AID FOR TRADE (AND ITS TRADE RELATED POLICIES). WE DO NOT THINK THAT GLOBAL AFT MONITORING SHOULD SEEK TO ESTABLISH GLOBAL PRIORITIES FOR AID FOR TRADE, AS CHALLENGES TO COUNTRIES TRADE EXPANSION ARE VERY COUNTRY SPECIFIC.**