



## **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 <a href="www.oecd.org/dac/aft/questionnaire">www.oecd.org/dac/aft/questionnaire</a> or contact the secretariats of the OECD (<a href="mailto:aft.monitoring@oecd.org">aft.monitoring@oecd.org</a>) or the WTO (<a href="mailto:aft.monitoring@wto.org">aft.monitoring@wto.org</a>).

COUNTRY: World Bank Group

A. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY									
1. HAS YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY CHANGED SINCE 2008?									
YES 🔀									
1.1 If YES, please rate the importance of each of the following changes?									
Greater focus on:  MOST IMPORTANT LESS NOT NOT SURE									
Economic growth		$\boxtimes$							
Poverty reduction		$\boxtimes$							
Climate change and a	green growth			$\boxtimes$					
Gender equality			$\boxtimes$						
Regional integration	$\boxtimes$								
Monitoring and evaluation	uating results								
Different geographic focu	ıs					$\boxtimes$			
Please specify:									
Different thematic focus									
Please specify: The new global trade environment, and the World Bank Group's (WBG) experience in delivering aid for trade assistance, led the WBG to focus its aid for trade priorities on increasing trade competitiveness and diversification; improving transport and logistics to facilitate trade; expanding market access and integration; and ensuring access to trade finance.									
Phasing out of aid for trade							$\boxtimes$		
Other									
Please specify:									
1.2 If YES, please rat	e the importance	e of the foll	low	ving driving fo	rces behind t	hese changes:			
MOST IMPORTANT LESS NOT NOT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT SURE									

The economic crisis		$\boxtimes$					
Changed priorities in the development strategies of partner countries							
Changed priorities in the development strategies of regional bodies		$\boxtimes$					
Change of national government		$\boxtimes$					
Changes in bilateral trade and investment relations							
Changed priorities in your development cooperation							
New research, approaches, or aid instruments		$\boxtimes$					
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?							
2. LOOKING AHEAD TO 2013, IS Y AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?	OUR GOVERN	IVIENT PLANT	VIIVO AIVI CII	ANGES TO ITS	•		
_		NOT SURI	_	NOT APPLICA			
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?	]	NOT SURI		NOT APPLICA			
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES ☑ NO □	]	NOT SURI		NOT APPLICA			
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES ☑ NO ☐  2.1 If YES, please rate the important	ee of the chang	NOT SURI	rnment is plan	NOT APPLICA	BLE NOT		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES  NO   2.1 If YES, please rate the important  Greater focus on:	most important	NOT SURI	rnment is plan	NOT APPLICA	BLE NOT		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES  NO   2.1 If YES, please rate the important  Greater focus on:  Economic growth	most important	NOT SURI	rnment is plan  LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	BLE NOT		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO   2.1 If YES, please rate the important  Greater focus on:  Economic growth  Poverty reduction	MOST IMPORTANT	NOT SURI	rnment is plan  LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	BLE NOT		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO   2.1 If YES, please rate the important  Greater focus on:  Economic growth  Poverty reduction  Climate change and green growth	MOST IMPORTANT	NOT SURI	rnment is plan  LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	BLE NOT		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO   2.1 If YES, please rate the important  Greater focus on:  Economic growth  Poverty reduction  Climate change and green growth  Gender equality	MOST IMPORTANT	NOT SURI	rnment is plan  LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	BLE NOT		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO   2.1 If YES, please rate the important  Greater focus on:  Economic growth  Poverty reduction  Climate change and green growth  Gender equality  Regional integration	MOST IMPORTANT	NOT SURI	rnment is plan  LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	BLE NOT		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO 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	MOST IMPORTANT	NOT SURI	rnment is plan  LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	NOT SURE		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO   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	MOST IMPORTANT	NOT SURI	rnment is plan  LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	NOT SURE		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO   2.1 If YES, please rate the important  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	IMPORTANT  IMPORTANT  IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	NOT SURE		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO   2.1 If YES, please rate the important  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 APPLICA	NOT SURE		
AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?  YES NO 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: A new Trade strategy will	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT  IMPORTANT  IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT APPLICA	NOT SURE		

в.	YOUR AID-FOR-TRAD	E FINANCING								
DEN	1AND									
3.	3. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FROM YOUR PARTNER COUNTRIES CHANGED SINCE 2008?									
SIGN	IGNIFICANTLY 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: Demand has increased mainly from countries in Sub Saharan Africa and some middle income countries in Middle East and North Africa and East and South Asia, for lending, technical assistance and capacity building										
4.	HAS THE DEMAND FO		RADE FOR	REGIONA	AL INTEGI	RATIC	ON PROGRA	AMMES		
SIGN	IFICANTLY INCREASED	INCREASED [	шттц	E/NO CHAN	IGE 🗌	DECL	INED 🗌	NOT SURE		
4.1 Afric	If the demand increas for trade: Demand ha a for trade facilitation a	s increased fr	om region	al bodies i		-				
RESC	OURCES									
5.	HAVE YOUR AID-FOR	-TRADE RESO	URCES IN	CREASED	SINCE 20	08?				
	YES 🖂		NO [				NOT SURE			
6.	DOES YOUR AGENCY	HAVE INDICA	ATIVE FOR	WARD SP	ENDING I	PLAN	s?			
	YES 🗌		NO ∑				NOT SURE			
6.1.	If YES, do these forwa	rd spending p	lans includ	e estimate	es for aid	for tr	ade?			
	YES		NO [				NOT SURE			
6.2	If YES, please specify	these estimat	es:							
C.	IMPLEMENTING YOU	R AID-FOR-T	RADE STRA	ATEGY						
7.	IN HOW MANY OF YOO OF DISCUSSION?	OUR POLICY D	DIALOGUES	S IS TRAD	E NOW A	REG	ULAR TOPIC	C		
		> 75%	75% - 50%	50% - 25%	6 < 25	5%	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE		
With	partner countries		$\boxtimes$			]				
With	regional communities					]				
8.	IS THIS AN IMPROVE	MENT COMP	ARED TO 2	.008?						
	SIGNIFICANT MODERATE LITTLE/NONE NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE						NOT APPLICABLE			

With partner countries			L	]   📙			
With regional communities							
9. IS THE PRIVATE SECT	OR INVOLVED	N YOUR DIAL	OGUE?				
	ALWAYS	SOMETI	MES	RARELY/NEVER		NOT SURE	
With partner countries	$\boxtimes$						
With regional communities	$\boxtimes$						
9.1 Please describe and provide examples of your experience in dialogues that involve the private sector: The Aid for Trade Facilitation Public Private Partnership (PPP), launched in October 2009, brings together Bank and private sector expertise to design concrete solutions that promote trade facilitation reform in developing countries. This PPP is a collaborative initiative between the World Bank, UPS International, IBM, Microsoft and other firms. For example, the World Bank is working with the Global Express Association (GEA), led by UPS, to deploy specific software for risk assessment for express packages in customs administrations is successfully being implemented in Mexico and Honduras. A second GEA project focuses on access to data compiled by express carriers (e.g., time for packages to clear Customs), with a pilot data set being developed on trade costs in 10 countries (Vietnam, Philippines, Indonesia, India, Mexico, Venezuela, Brazil, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus).  The World Bank is also working with Total, the Partnership for Road Safety in Africa, leveraged with an initiative to increase incentives for large shippers and trucking firms to improve safety on key corridors by documenting the trade facilitation benefits.							
	<del>-</del>						
10. IS CIVIL SOCIETY INVOLVED IN YOUR DIALOGUE?							
	ALWAYS	SOMETI	MES	RARE	LY/NEVER	NOT SURE	
With partner countries							
With regional communities							
10.1 Please describe and p civil society: The Wor is being prepared. More received	ld Bank consult	s with the civil	society	each a C	Country Ass	istance Strategy	
11. ARE YOU HARMONIS WERE BEFORE 2008?		ATEGY WITH	OTHER I	OONOR	S BETTER N	IOW THAN YOU	
SIGNIFICANTLY MODE	RATELY F	RARELY/NEVER		NOT SUR	E 🗌   I	NOT APPLICABLE	
11.1 If you are harmonising	g better, how of	ten do you use	the foll	lowing d	approaches	?	
	ALWAYS	SOMETI	MES	RARE	LY/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?									
		SIGNIFICAI	NT	MODERA	DERATE LI		NOT SURE		NOT APPLICABLE
With partner country priorit	With partner country priorities								
With the Enhanced integrated Framework				$\boxtimes$					
With regional priorities									
Please elaborate with examp									
12.1. How many of your a	nid-for-trade	orogrammes	are a	ligned a	round	trade	priorities	of?	
	> 75%	75% - 50%	50%	5 - 25%	< 2	5%	NOT SUF	RE	NOT APPLICABLE
Partner countries' development strategies	$\boxtimes$								
The DTIS Action Matrix (for LDCs)		$\boxtimes$							
Regional organisations development strategies				$\boxtimes$					
13. HAS THE MONITORING OF YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE PROGRAMMES IMPROVED SINCE 2008?									
SIGNIFICANTLY	MODERAT	ELY 🛛	RARELY/NEVER N			NO	OT SURE		
13.1 If there have been i	mprovement.	s, how often	do yo	u:					
-	•	ALV	VAYS	SOM	IETIMES	S RA	RELY/NEVE	R	NOT SURE
Use your own monitoring			$\boxtimes$						
Rely on partner countries' m	onitoring prod	cesses [			$\boxtimes$				
Use joint monitoring arrang	ements								
13.2 Please provide examples and describe your experience with monitoring your aid-for-trade programmes: M&E so far has largely relied on before-after comparisons using surveys carried out in partnership with clients. The trend is now to turn to rigorous impact evaluation techniques using either Randomized Control Trials or quasi-experimental methods. A good example of the latter is the evaluation of Tunisia's export promotion agency currently under way. The use of econometric techniques combining data from surveys, customs and the national statistical institute has made it possible to disentangle effects at the intensive vs. extensive margin and long-run (persistent) vs. short-run. RCTs are currently considered for projects with a trade-and-gender dimension.									
D. IC VOLIDAD FOR	DADE WORK	INC3							
D. IS YOUR AID FOR T	RADE WORK	ING?							
14. DOES YOUR AID-FO	R-TRADE ST	RATEGY DEF	INE C	LEAR O	BJECT	IVES?			
YES 🖂	ΝО [			NOT SUF	RE 🗌		NOT A	PPLI	CABLE
14.1 If YES, what are the	objectives of	your aid-for-	trade	strateg	ıy?				
		MOST IMPORTANT		MPORTA	NT		SS RTANT	IIV	NOT 1PORTANT

Enhanced understanding of the role of trade in economic development (awareness)	$\boxtimes$							
Increased trade profile (mainstreaming)								
Larger aid-for-trade flows								
Increased exports	$\boxtimes$							
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?								
	AID FOR TRADE	PROGRAMMES	THAT CONTAIN	N				
QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?				APPLICABLE				
QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?           > 75% □         75% - 50% □         50% - 2	25% ⊠ < 25′	% 🗌 NOT S	URE NOT	APPLICABLE				
QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?	25% ⊠ < 25′	% 🗌 NOT S	URE NOT	APPLICABLE				
QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?           > 75% □         75% - 50% □         50% - 2           16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVAL	25% ⊠ < 25′	% NOT S	URE NOT	APPLICABLE				
QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?           > 75% □         75% - 50% □         50% - 2           16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVAL	25% ⊠ < 25°	% NOT S	URE NOT	APPLICABLE  RAMMES				
OUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?  > 75% ☐ 75% - 50% ☐ 50% - 2  16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVALOR PROJECTS?	.UATED ITS AID-	% NOT S	URE NOT	APPLICABLE  RAMMES				
OUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?  > 75% □ 75% - 50% □ 50% - 2  16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVALOR PROJECTS?  Overall strategy  Programmes and projects  Both	VES	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI	RATEGY, PROGE	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				
OUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?  > 75% ☐ 75% - 50% ☐ 50% - 2  16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVALOR PROJECTS?  Overall strategy  Programmes and projects	VES	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI	RATEGY, PROGE	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				
OUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?  > 75% □ 75% - 50% □ 50% - 2  16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVALOR PROJECTS?  Overall strategy  Programmes and projects  Both	VES  VES  And the (se) evaluation	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI	RATEGY, PROGE	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				
OUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?  > 75% □ 75% - 50% □ 50% - 2  16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVAL OR PROJECTS?  Overall strategy  Programmes and projects  Both  16.1 If YES, please provide a copy of the	VES  VES  And the (se) evaluation	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI  N  [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [	RATEGY, PROGE	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				
OUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?  > 75% □ 75% - 50% □ 50% - 2  16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVAL OR PROJECTS?  Overall strategy  Programmes and projects  Both  16.1 If YES, please provide a copy of the	VES  VES  VES  VES  VES  VES  VES  VES	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI  In (s) when submit to of its:	RATEGY, PROGE	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				
Overall strategy   Programmes and projects   Overall strategy   Overall strategy   Overall strategy   Programmes and projects   Overall strategy   Overall strategy	VES  He(se) evaluation  YES  YES	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI  In (s) when submit to of its:	RATEGY, PROGRATEGY PRO	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				
OVERALL STREET   SOWN   SOWN	VES  He(se) evaluation  YES  THE SE STATE OF T	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI  In (s) when submit to of its:	RATEGY, PROGRATEGY PRO	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				
Overall strategy   Programmes and projects   Overall strategy   Overall strategy   Overall strategy   Programmes and projects   Overall strategy   Overall strategy	VES  He(se) evaluation  YES  THE SE STATE OF T	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI  In (s) when submit to of its:	RATEGY, PROGRATEGY PRO	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				
OVERALL STREET   SOWN   SOWN	VES  He(se) evaluation  YES  THE SE STATE OF T	NOT S  FOR-TRADE STI  In (s) when submit to of its:	RATEGY, PROGRATEGY PRO	APPLICABLE   RAMMES  NOT SURE				

Programmes and projects								
Both								
		ı	ı	ı				
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			$\boxtimes$					
Difficulty in obtaining in-country data	$\boxtimes$							
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			$\boxtimes$					
Difficulty in identifying quantifiable objectives				$\boxtimes$				
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 INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS SUCH AS UGANDA-KENYA CORRIDOR WHICH HAS LED TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED TRADE COSTS; POLICY DIALOGUE LEADING TO ADOPTION OF TRADE-ENHANCING REFORMS SUCH AS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MAURITIUS SINCE 2006-7, BORDER-MODERNIZATION PROJECTS, AND KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS USED FOR THE MAINSTREAMING OF THE GENDER ISSUES IN TRADE PROJECTS THAT LED FOR EXAMPLE THE GOVERNMENT OF CAMBODIA TO ADOPT POLICY MEASURES THAT CONTRIBUTED TO EMPOWERING WOMEN IN TRADE-RELATED ACTIVITIES.								
19. DOES YOUR GOVERNMENT CONSIDER IT USEFUL TO MONITOR AID FOR TRADE AT THE GLOBAL LEVEL?								
VERY USEFUL 🛛 USEFUL	. 🗆	NOT USEFUL	NO	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: IMPROVEMENT IN ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES USED. THE FIELD STILL RELIES EXCESSIVELY ON OUTDATED METHODS COMPARED TO OTHER FIELDS OF DEVELOPMENT WORK. AN ENERGETIC PUSH FOR THE ADOPTION OF IMPACT EVALUATION TECHNIQUES AND THEIR								

MAINSTREAMING IN PROJECT DESIGN IS NEEDED.