



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: IMF

A.	A. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY												
1.	HAS YOUR AID-I	OR-TRADE STR	ATEGY CH	ΔN	GED SINCE 20	008?							
	YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT SURE ☐ NOT APPLICABLE ☐												
1.1	I If YES, please rate the importance of each of the following changes?												
Great	ter focus on:		MOST IMPORTANT		IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE					
• E	conomic growth												
• P													
• C													
Gender equality													
Regional integration													
Monitoring and evaluating results													
Differ	rent geographic focu	ıs											
Pleas	e specify:												
Differ	rent thematic focus												
Pleas	e specify:												
Phasi	ng out of aid for tra	de											
Othe	r												
Pleas	e specify:												
1.2	If YES, please rat	e the importance	e of the fol	lou	ving driving fo	rces behind t	hese changes:						
			MOST IMPORTAN	ΙΤ	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE					
The e	conomic crisis		П			П							

Changed priorities in the development strategies of partner countries							
Changed priorities in the development strategies of regional bodies							
Change of national government							
Changes in bilateral trade and investment relations							
Changed priorities in your development cooperation							
New research, approaches, or aid instruments							
More focus on triangular co-operation							
Other							
Please specify:							
2. LOOKING AHEAD TO 2013, IS Y AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?	OUR GOVERN	MENT PLAN	IING ANY CH	ANGES TO ITS	5		
YES ☐ NO ☒ NOT SURE ☐ NOT APPLICABLE ☐							
YES NO 🗵	J	NOT SURE		NOT APPLICA	BLE		
2.1 If YES, please rate the important					ABLE [_]		
					NOT SURE		
2.1 If YES, please rate the important	e of the chang	es your gover	nment is plan	ning:	NOT		
2.1 If YES, please rate the important Greater focus on:	e of the chang	es your gover	nment is plan	ning:	NOT		
2.1 If YES, please rate the important Greater focus on: Economic growth	e of the chang	es your gover	nment is plan	ning:	NOT		
2.1 If YES, please rate the important Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction	e of the chang	es your gover	nment is plan	ning:	NOT		
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth	e of the chang	es your gover	nment is plan	ning:	NOT		
2.1 If YES, please rate the important Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality	e of the chang	es your gover	nment is plan	ning:	NOT		
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus	e of the chang	es your gover	nment is plan	ning:	NOT		
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify:	MOST IMPORTANT	es your gover	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE		
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify: Different thematic focus	MOST IMPORTANT	es your gover	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE		
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify: Different thematic focus Please specify:	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE		
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify: Different thematic focus	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE		
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify: Different thematic focus Please specify:	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE		

в.	YOUR AID-FOR-TRAD	E FINANCING									
DEMAND											
3.	3. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FROM YOUR PARTNER COUNTRIES CHANGED SINCE 2008?										
SIGNI	FICANTLY INCREASED	INCREASED [LITT	LE/NO	CHANGI		DECLINED	NOT SURE			
3.1	3.1 If the demand increased, please describe from which countries and for which type of aid for trade:										
4.	4. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FOR REGIONAL INTEGRATION PROGRAMMES CHANGED SINCE 2008?										
SIGNI	SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED ☐ INCREASED ☐ LITTLE/NO CHANGE ☒ DECLINED ☐ NOT SURE ☐										
4.1	If the demand increas	ed, please des	cribe from	which	h regio	ns and fo	or which type o	f aid			
RESC	DURCES										
5.	HAVE VOUR AID FOR	TDADE DECO	LIBCES IN	CDEAG	CED CIN	ICE 2000	22				
5.	YES	-TRADE RESU		ES INCREASED SINCE 2008? NO ⊠ NC				NOT SURE			
			NO E				1401 3011	- Ш			
6.	DOES YOUR AGENCY	HAVE INDICA	TIVE FOR	WARD) SPEN	DING PL	ANS?				
	YES		NO ∑	3			NOT SUR	E 🗌			
6.1.	If YES, do these forwa	rd spending pl	lans includ	e estii	nates f	or aid fo	r trade?				
	YES		NO [NOT SURE				
6.2	If YES, please specify	these estimate	es:								
C.	IMPLEMENTING YOU	R AID-FOR-TE	RADE STRA	ATEGY	,						
7.	IN HOW MANY OF YOO OF DISCUSSION?	OUR POLICY D	OIALOGUES	S IS TF	RADE N	IOW A R	EGULAR TOPI	С			
		> 75%	75% - 50%	50%	- 25%	< 25%	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE			
With	partner countries				=						
With	regional communities				=						
8.	IS THIS AN IMPROVE	MENT COMPA	ARED TO 2	2008?							
		SIGNIFICANT	MODER	ATE	LITTLE	E/NONE	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE			
With	partner countries					\boxtimes					
With	regional communities					\boxtimes					

9.	IS THE PRIVA	ATE SEC	TOR INVOLV	ED IN Y	YOUR	DIA	ALOGUE?					
		ALWAYS SOMETIMES RARELY/NEVER				VER		NOT SURE				
With partner countries									\boxtimes			
With	regional commi	unities							\boxtimes			
9.1	Please descri private secto		provide exan	ples of	your	ехр	erience ii	n dic	alogues th	at inv	olve t	he
10.	IS CIVIL SOCI	ETY IN	VOLVED IN Y	OUR D	IALOG	GUE	?					
	ALWAYS SOMETIMES RARELY/NEVER NO								NOT SURE			
With	partner countri	es										
With	regional commi	unities										
10.1	Please descri	be and	provide exan	nples of	your	ехр	erience ii	n did	alogues th	at inv	olve	
11.	11. ARE YOU HARMONISING YOUR STRATEGY WITH OTHER DONORS BETTER NOW THAN YOU WERE BEFORE 2008?											
SIGN	IIFICANTLY	MOI	DERATELY 🗌	RARE	ELY/NE	VER		NO	T SURE 🔲	1	NOT AF	PPLICABLE 🛛
11.1 If you are harmonising better, how often do you use the following approaches?												
			ALWA	/S	S	ОМЕ	TIMES		RARELY/NE	VER		NOT SURE
Joint	needs assessme	ent										
Co-fir	nancing											
Secto	r-wide approac	hes										
Joint	implementation	1										
Comr	mon monitoring											
Joint	evaluation											
Othe	r											
Pleas	se specify:											
12.	HAS ALIGNN	1ENT O	F YOUR AID-	FOR-TR	RADE	PRC	OGRAMN	1E II	MPROVE	SINC	E 200	8?
				SIGN	NIFICAN	ΙΤ	MODERA	TE	LITTLE/ NONE	NO SUR		NOT APPLICABLE
With	partner country	priorit	ies									
With	the Enhanced in	ntegrate	ed Framework]	
With	regional prioriti	es]	\boxtimes
Pleas	e elaborate witi	h examp	oles:									
12.1.	How many o	f your d	iid-for-trade μ	rogran	nmes	are	aligned a	ırou	nd trade	prioriti	ies of:	
			> 75%	75% - !	50%	50)% - 25%		< 25%	NOT S	SURE	NOT APPLICABLE

Partner countries' development strategies										
The DTIS Action Matrix (for LDCs)										
Regional organisations development strategies										
-										
13. HAS THE MONITORING OF YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE PROGRAMMES IMPROVED SINCE 2008?										
SIGNIFICANTLY	ELY 🗌	R	ARELY/NE	VER		NOT	T SURE 🛛			
13.1 If there have been improvements, how often do you:										
		,	ALWAYS	SOM	IETIMES	RAI	RELY/NEVER	NOT SURE		
Use your own monitoring										
Rely on partner countries' m	cesses									
Use joint monitoring arrange										
13.2 Please provide examples and describe your experience with monitoring your aid-for-trade programmes:										
<u> </u>										
D. IS YOUR AID FOR T	RADE WORK	ING?								
								1		
14. DOES YOUR AID-FO	R-TRADE ST	RATEGY D	EFINE (CLEAR O	BJECTIV	ES?				
YES	NO [NOT SUI	RE 🗌		NOT AP	PLICABLE 🛚		
14.1 If YES, what are the	objectives of	your aid-f	or-trad	e strateg	ıy?					
		MOST IMPORTA		IMPORT	ANT		ESS DRTANT	NOT IMPORTANT		
Enhanced understanding of trole of trade in economic detaction (awareness)										
Increased trade profile (mair	nstreaming)									
Larger aid-for-trade flows]					
Increased exports										
Increased trade	Increased trade									
Funcition divine distantian								Ш		
Export diversification										
Increased economic growth										
Increased economic growth	inability									

Other										
Please specify:										
15. WHAT IS THE SHARE OF YOUR AID FOR TRADE PROGRAMMES THAT CONTAIN QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?										
> 75% - 50%	50% - 2	25%	< 25	% 🔲	NOT S	URE 🗌	NOT	APPLICABLE 🛚		
46 HAC VOLID COVERNMENT EVALUATED ITC AID FOR TRADE CERATECY PROCESSASSES										
16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVALUATED ITS AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY, PROGRAMMES OR PROJECTS?										
			YES		N	10		NOT SURE		
Overall strategy										
Programmes and projects										
Both										
16.1 If YES, please provide a cop	py of tl	he(se) ev	aluatio	n(s) w	hen submi	tting this o	questi	onnaire.		
16.2 If NO, is your government	planni	ng an ev	aluatior	of its	s:					
		YES			NO		NOT SURE			
Overall strategy						\leq				
Programmes and projects										
Both										
16.3 If YES, for which year is the	e evalu	ation pla	anned?							
		20	10		2011	2012	!	2013		
Overall strategy										
Programmes and projects										
Both										
17. PLEASE RATE THE IMPOR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEG						GES IN EV	'ALUA	TING YOUR		
		MC IMPOF		IMI	PORTANT	LESS IMPORTA		NOT IMPORTANT		
Difficulty in identifying quantifiable objectives										
Difficulty in obtaining in-country da	ita									
Absence of suitable indicators										
Budgetary constraints										
Ability of in-country staff to collect report data	and									
Ability of project partners to collect	t and									

Difficulty of assigning trace the programme	le outcomes to								
Difficulty in identifying qu objectives	antifiable								
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:									
19. DOES YOUR GOVERNMENT CONSIDER IT USEFUL TO MONITOR AID FOR TRADE AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL?									
VERY USEFUL USEFUL			NOT USEFUL	NO	T 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:									