



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: Islamic Development Bank

A.	YOUR AID-FOR-	TRADE STRATEG	ξY					1		
1.	HAS YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY CHANGED SINCE 2008?									
	YES 🖂	NO 🗌	NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE							
1.1	If YES, please rat	the importance of each of the following changes?								
Great	ter focus on:		MOST IMPORTANT LESS NOT NOT IMPORTANT SURE							
• E	conomic growth		\boxtimes							
• P	overty reduction		\boxtimes							
• C	limate change and g	reen growth								
• G	ender equality				\boxtimes					
• R	egional integration		\boxtimes							
• N	Monitoring and evaluating results									
Diffe	rent geographic focu	nt geographic focus								
Pleas	e specify: Africa,	Asia (CIS)	, MENA							
Diffe	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 foll	ow	ving driving fo	orces behind t	hese changes:			
			MOST IMPORTAN	Т	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE		
The e	conomic crisis									

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 Changed priorities in your development cooperation New research, approaches, or aid instruments More focus on triangular co-operation Other Changed priorities in your development cooperation New research, approaches, or aid instruments More focus on triangular co-operation Other Changed priorities in your development cooperation Chang	strategies of partner countries										
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 Changed specify: Changed priorities in your development cooperation Changed pri				\boxtimes							
Investment relations Changed priorities in your development cooperation New research, approaches, or aid instruments More focus on triangular co-operation Other Other Dease specify: 2. LOOKING AHEAD TO 2013, IS YOUR GOVERNMENT PLANNING ANY CHANGES TO ITS AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY? YES NO NOTSURE NOT APPLICABLE 2.1 If YES, please rate the importance of the changes your government is planning: Greater focus on: MOST IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT SURE Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify: Phasing out of aid for trade NE SURE SURE SURE SURE SURE SURE SURE SUR	Change of national government										
Cooperation	_										
Instruments More focus on triangular co-operation Other											
Co-operation Other			\boxtimes								
Please specify: 2. LOOKING AHEAD TO 2013, IS YOUR GOVERNMENT PLANNING ANY CHANGES TO ITS AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY? YES NO NOT NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE 2.1 If YES, please rate the importance of the changes your government is planning: Greater focus on: MOST IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT SURE Economic growth NOT SURE Climate change and green growth NOT SURE Gender equality NOT SURE Gender equality NOT SURE Climate change and green growth NOT SURE Climate changes your government is planning: NOT NOT NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE NOT APPLIC	_										
2. LOOKING AHEAD TO 2013, IS YOUR GOVERNMENT PLANNING ANY CHANGES TO ITS AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY? YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE 2.1 If YES, please rate the importance of the changes your government is planning: Greater focus on: MOST IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT SURE Economic growth NOT NOT NOT SURE Economic growth NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT SURE Economic growth NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT SURE Economic growth NOT	Other										
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY? YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE 2.1 If YES, please rate the importance of the changes your government is planning: Greater focus on:	Please specify:										
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY? YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE 2.1 If YES, please rate the importance of the changes your government is planning: Greater focus on:											
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance of the changes your government is planning: Greater focus on: MOST											
Greater focus on: MOST IMPORTANT IMPORTANT LESS IMPORTANT NOT SURE 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 □ □ □ □ Phasing out of aid for trade □ □ □ □	YES ⊠ NO [NOT SURE		NOT APPLICABLE						
IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT SURE	2.1 If YES, please rate the importan										
Poverty reduction			, , ,	Time is proin	illing.						
Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify: Different thematic focus Please specify: Phasing out of aid for trade	Greater focus on:	MOST		LESS	NOT						
Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Different thematic focus Please specify: Phasing out of aid for trade Different equality Different thematic focus		MOST IMPORTANT		LESS	NOT						
Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify: Different thematic focus Please specify: Phasing out of aid for trade	Economic growth	MOST IMPORTANT		LESS	NOT						
Monitoring and evaluating results	Economic growth Poverty reduction	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS	NOT						
Different geographic focus	Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS	NOT						
Please specify: Different thematic focus	Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS	NOT						
Different thematic focus	Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS	NOT						
Please specify: Phasing out of aid for trade	Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS	NOT						
Phasing out of aid for trade	Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS	NOT						
	Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality Regional integration Monitoring and evaluating results Different geographic focus Please specify:	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT						
Other	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	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT						
	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	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	SURE					
Please specify:	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: Phasing out of aid for trade	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	SURE					

В. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE FINANCING **DEMAND** HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FROM YOUR PARTNER COUNTRIES CHANGED 3. **SINCE 2008?** SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED INCREASED 🖂 LITTLE/NO CHANGE DECLINED NOT SURE If the demand increased, please describe from which countries and for which type of aid for trade: SPECA Countries, Africa, Infrastruture, Physical & Social, Capacity Building, Regional Investment, Trade financing. 4. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FOR REGIONAL INTEGRATION PROGRAMMES **CHANGED SINCE 2008?** SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED LITTLE/NO CHANGE INCREASED 🖂 DECLINED NOT SURE If the demand increased, please describe from which regions and for which type of aid for trade: SPECA, MENA, AFRICA, Project Financing, Cross Border corridors. **RESOURCES** 5. HAVE YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE RESOURCES INCREASED SINCE 2008? YES 🖂 NOT SURE NO 6. DOES YOUR AGENCY HAVE INDICATIVE FORWARD SPENDING PLANS? YES 🖂 NOT SURE NO 🗌 *6.1.* If YES, do these forward spending plans include estimates for aid for trade? NO NOT SURE ☐ 6.2 If YES, please specify these estimates: 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 \boxtimes With partner countries With regional communities \boxtimes IS THIS AN IMPROVEMENT COMPARED TO 2008? SIGNIFICANT MODERATE LITTLE/NONE NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE With partner countries \boxtimes \boxtimes \Box With regional communities

9. IS THE PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVED IN YOUR DIALOGUE?										
	ALWAYS SOMETIMES F				R	ARELY/NE	VER		NOT SURE	
With partner countries	\boxtimes									
With regional communities	\boxtimes									
	private sector: Regional Investment Forums, Bilateral Dialogues, Business Matching, World									
10. IS CIVIL SOCIETY INVO	Y INVOLVED IN YOUR DIALOGUE?									
	ALWAYS	5	SOMI	ETIMES	R	ARELY/NE	VER		NOT SURE	
With partner countries				\boxtimes						
With regional communities				\boxtimes						
10.1 Please describe and pr civil society: Through to either build the capacity o designed/implemented by th	its NGO Prog f the NGOs o	gram II	DBG prov	vides direc	t fun	nding in t	he for		small grants	
11. ARE YOU HARMONIS WERE BEFORE 2008?	ING YOUR S	TRATE	GY WITI	H OTHER I	DON	IORS BET	TER N	IOW	THAN YOU	
SIGNIFICANTLY MODER	RATELY 🗌	RARE	LY/NEVER		NOT	SURE	ı	NOT A	APPLICABLE	
11.1 If you are harmonising	better, how	often	do you u	ise the fol	lowi	ng appro	aches	?		
	ALWAYS	5	SOMI	ETIMES	R	ARELY/NE	VER		NOT SURE	
Joint needs assessment				\boxtimes						
Co-financing										
Sector-wide approaches										
Joint implementation			\boxtimes							
Common monitoring										
Joint evaluation			\boxtimes							
Other										
Please specify:										
12. HAS ALIGNMENT OF YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE PROGRAMME IMPROVED SINCE 2008?										
		SIGN	IFICANT	MODERA	TE	LITTLE/ NONE	NO SUR		NOT APPLICABLE	
With partner country priorities										
With the Enhanced integrated	Framework									
With regional priorities										
Please elaborate with examples:										
12.1. How many of your aid-for-trade programmes are aligned around trade priorities of?										

	> 75%	75% -	75% - 50% 5		5 - 25% < 25		6	NOT SURI	NOT APPLICABLE	
Partner countries' development strategies		×]					
The DTIS Action Matrix (for LDCs)]							
Regional organisations development strategies]	\boxtimes]					
13. HAS THE MONITOR	R AID-I	FOR-TR	ADE F	ROGR	AMMES	S IM	PROVED S	INCE 2008?		
SIGNIFICANTLY	MODERAT	ELY 🛛		RAR	ELY/NEV	/ER 🗌		NOT	SURE	
13.1 If there have been in	mprovement	s, how	often do	you:						
			ALWA	YS	SOME	TIMES	RA	RELY/NEVER	NOT SURE	
Use your own monitoring										
Rely on partner countries' m	onitoring prod	cesses								
Use joint monitoring arrange	ements					\leq				
Operations Evaluate related infrastruct countries. It also	evaluattion mechanism for aid-for-trade programmes. However, the Operations Evaluation Department of IDGB conducts evaluation of trade-related infrastructure projects (such as roads and highways) in member countries. It also assesses the performance of the portfolio of trade operations in member countries through country assistance evaluations.							of trade- in member of trade		
D. IS YOUR AID FOR TE	RADE WORK	ING?								
14. DOES YOUR AID-FO	R-TRADE ST	RATEG	Y DEFIN	IF CLF	AR OR	IFCTIVI	FS?			
YES 🖂					NOT SURE			NOT APPLICABLE		
14.1 If YES, what are the	objectives of	vour a	id-for-tr							
		N	1OST ORTANT		MPORTA			LESS DRTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	
Enhanced understanding of the role of trade in economic development (awareness)			\boxtimes							
Increased trade profile (mainstreaming)			\boxtimes							
Larger aid-for-trade flows					\boxtimes					
Increased exports										
Increased trade	Increased trade									
Export diversification										

Increased economic growth								
Reduced poverty								
Greater environmental sustainability			\boxtimes					
Greater gender equality								
Other				П				
Please specify:						_		
rieuse specijy.								
15. WHAT IS THE SHARE OF YOUR AID FOR TRADE PROGRAMMES THAT CONTAIN QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?								
> 75%	25% 🗌	< 25%	NOT S	URE 🗌	NOT	NOT APPLICABLE		
			'	<u>'</u>				
16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVAL OR PROJECTS?	UATED ITS	AID-FOR-	TRADE STE	RATEGY, P	ROGR	RAMMES		
	YE	S	N	10		NOT SURE		
Overall strategy								
Programmes and projects								
Both								
16.1 If YES, please provide a copy of the	ne(se) evalu	ation(s) w	hen submi	tting this q	questic	onnaire.		
16.2 If NO, is your government planni	ng an evalu	ation of it	s:					
	YE	S .	N	10		NOT SURE		
Overall strategy								
Programmes and projects	Ш							
Both	ustion planned?					Ш		
16.3 If YES, for which year is the evalu	-	ed?	2011					
	2010	2010		2012	2013			
Overall strategy								
Programmes and projects				\boxtimes				
Both	\boxtimes			\boxtimes		\boxtimes		
17. PLEASE RATE THE IMPORTANCE AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY, PRO				GES IN EV	ALUA	TING YOUR		
	MOST IMPORTAI		PORTANT	LESS IMPORTA	ANT	NOT IMPORTANT		
Difficulty in identifying quantifiable objectives								
Difficulty in obtaining in-country data								

Absence of suitable indicators								
Budgetary constraints								
Ability of in-country staff to collect and report data	\boxtimes							
Ability of project partners to collect and report data	\boxtimes							
Difficulty of assigning trade outcomes to the programme	\boxtimes							
Difficulty in identifying quantifiable objectives								
COULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOOD PRACTICES? Please list and describe: WITH A VEW TO HAVE A MORE COHESIVE APPROACH AND TO CREATE A SYNERGY WITHIN THE IDB GROUP, A SPECIFIC BODY, NAMELY GROUP RELATED TRADE ISSUES COMMITTEE (GTRC) HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED. UNDER ITS TOR, THE COMMITTEE IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE TO COORDINATE THE WORK OF THE AFT WITHIN THE IDBG. THE COMMITTEE IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE MANAGEMENT REGARDING THE ONGOING WORK OF THE AFT. THE GTRC IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE IN IDENTIFYING AND SELECTING PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS AT THE IDBG LEVEL, IN ADDITION TO ADVOCATING THE OBJECTIVES AND CAUSE OF THE AFT INITIATIVE, WITHIN THE IDBG AND ITS MEMBER COUNTRIES. REGIONAL APPROACH TO PROJECTS IN COLLABORATION WITH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS, INCLUDING FOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS. FOR EXAMPLE THE SILK ROAD PROJECT AZERBAIJAN, WHICH HAS CONTRIBUTED TO ENHANCING TRADE ACROSS COUNTRIES. DEVELOPMENT OF BORDER AREAS FOR FACILITATING TRADE. FOR EXAMPLE,IDB PROVIDED \$ ONE MILLION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANT FOR SYRIA AND TURKEY FOR SUPPORTING DEVELOPMENT OFBORDER AREAS OF THESE COUNTRIES IN ORDER TO PROMOTE BILATERAL RELATIONS COOPERATION AND FACILITATION OF TRADE								
19. DOES YOUR GOVERNMENT CONSIDER IT USEFUL TO MONITOR AID FOR TRADE AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL?								
VERY USEFUL 🛛 USEFU	L	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: LACK OF FOCUS, NEED FOR MORE TRANSPARENCY, LACK OF DATA, LACK OF TECHNICAL EXPERTISE TO MONITOR BOTH AT DONOR								

AND RECEPIENT LEVEL.