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: Netherlands

A. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY

1. HAS YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY CHANGED SINCE 2008?

YES ☐	NO ☒	NOT SURE ☐	NOT APPLICABLE ☐

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
• 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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Please specify:					

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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 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	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT 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: The economic crisis , new policy and budgetary cuts urge the new NL government to reconsider the spending plans. The (thematic) outcome is not entirely clear yet, but what is clear is that Aid for Trade remains a priority to that extent that it will not be hit hard by expenditure cuts. The modalities public private partnerships and private sector development have (succesfully) gained in weight.					
Different thematic focus	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
Please specify: Priorities: food security, water management					
Phasing out of aid for trade	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please specify: N/A (as stated, the financial input to Aid for Trade is not expected to decrease)

B. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE FINANCING

DEMAND

3. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FROM YOUR PARTNER COUNTRIES CHANGED SINCE 2008?

SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED ☐	INCREASED ☐	LITTLE/NO CHANGE ☒	DECLINED ☐	NOT SURE ☐

3.1 If the demand increased, please describe from which countries and for which type of aid for trade:

4. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FOR REGIONAL INTEGRATION PROGRAMMES CHANGED SINCE 2008?

SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASED ☐	INCREASED ☒	LITTLE/NO CHANGE ☐	DECLINED ☐	NOT SURE ☐

4.1 If the demand increased, please describe from which regions and for which type of aid for trade:

West-Africa (food and agriculture) Southern Africa (implementation of liberalisation efforts and related policies), Eastern Africa (Trade Facilitation Facility, TradeMark Eastern Africa).

RESOURCES

5. HAVE YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE RESOURCES INCREASED SINCE 2008?

YES ☒	NO ☐	NOT SURE ☐

6. DOES YOUR AGENCY HAVE INDICATIVE FORWARD SPENDING PLANS?

YES ☒	NO ☐	NOT SURE ☐

6.1. If YES, do these forward spending plans include estimates for aid for trade?

YES ☐	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
With partner countries	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

With regional communities	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

8. IS THIS AN IMPROVEMENT COMPARED TO 2008?

	SIGNIFICANT	MODERATE	LITTLE/NONE	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
With partner countries	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
With regional communities	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

9. IS THE PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVED IN YOUR DIALOGUE?

	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	NOT SURE
With partner countries	☐	☒	☐	☐
With regional communities	☐	☒	☐	☐

9.1 Please describe and provide examples of your experience in dialogues that involve the private sector: Concern of private sector (both domestic and Dutch) may be addressed over policy- or regular dialogues. Of course even more so in sectors that are heavily under government control, such as resources or services. Issues are often lack of transparency, conflicting regulations, lack of regulations, poor enforcement, unpredictable taxation or lengthy customs procedures.

10. IS CIVIL SOCIETY INVOLVED IN YOUR DIALOGUE?

	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	NOT SURE
With partner countries	☐	☒	☐	☐
With regional communities	☐	☒	☐	☐

10.1 Please describe and provide examples of your experience in dialogues that involve civil society:

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	☐	☒	☐	☐
Co-financing	☐	☒	☐	☐
Sector-wide approaches	☐	☒	☐	☐
Joint implementation	☐	☒	☐	☐
Common monitoring	☐	☒	☐	☐
Joint evaluation	☐	☒	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
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% - 50%	50% - 25%	< 25%	NOT 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 ☐	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	☐	☒	☐	☐
Rely on partner countries' monitoring processes	☐	☐	☐	☒
Use joint monitoring arrangements	☐	☒	☐	☐

13.2 Please provide examples and describe your experience with monitoring your aid-for-trade programmes:

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)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Increased trade profile (mainstreaming)	☐	☒	☐	☐
Larger aid-for-trade flows	☐	☐	☐	☐
Increased exports	☐	☐	☐	☐

Increased trade	☐	☐	☐	☐
Export diversification	☐	☒	☐	☐
Increased economic growth	☐	☒	☐	☐
Reduced poverty	☐	☒	☐	☐
Greater environmental sustainability	☐	☐	☐	☐
Greater gender equality	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐
Please specify:				

15. WHAT IS THE SHARE OF YOUR AID FOR TRADE PROGRAMMES THAT CONTAIN QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?

> 75%	75% - 50%	50% - 25%	< 25%	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐

16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVALUATED ITS AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY, PROGRAMMES OR PROJECTS?

	YES	NO	NOT SURE
Overall strategy	☐	☐	☒
Programmes and projects	☒	☐	☐
Both	☐	☐	☐

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	☐	☒	☐
Programmes and projects	☒	☐	☐
Both	☐	☐	☐

16.3 If YES, for which year is the evaluation planned?

	2010	2011	2012	2013
Overall strategy	☐	☐	☐	☐
Programmes and projects	☐	☒	☐	☐
Both	☐	☐	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☒	☐
Difficulty in obtaining in-country data	☐	☒	☐	☐
Absence of suitable indicators	☐	☒	☐	☐
Budgetary constraints	☐	☐	☒	☐
Ability of in-country staff to collect and report data	☐	☐	☒	☐
Ability of project partners to collect and report data	☐	☐	☒	☐
Difficulty of assigning trade outcomes to the programme	☒	☐	☐	☐
Difficulty in identifying quantifiable objectives	☐	☐	☒	☐

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: YES, SEE ATTACHMENT FOR IDH. WE HOPE TO HIGHLIGHT THIS AND A CBI CASE IN A SIDE EVENT DURING THE AID FOR TRADE REVIEW.

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: HARD TO AGGREGATE OUTPUT DATA BECAUSE OF A LACK OF UNIFORMITY AND BECAUSE SUCCESSES CAN ONLY BE ATTRIBUTED TO AID TO A LIMITED EXTENT