



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: SWEDEN

A. YOUR AID-FOR-	TRADE STRATEG	ίΥ								
1. HAS YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY CHANGED SINCE 2008?										
YES 🗌	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 LESS NOT IMPORTANT IMPORTANT SUI										
• Economic growth										
• Poverty reduction										
Climate change and g	reen growth									
 Gender equality 										
Regional integration										
Monitoring and evaluation	ating results									
Different geographic focu	IS									
Please specify:										
Different thematic focus										
Please specify:										
Phasing out of aid for trad										
Other										
Please specify:										
1.2 If YES, please rate	e the importance	e of the fol	low	ving driving fo	rces behind t	hese changes:				
		MOST IMPORTAN	ΙΤ	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:									
	e of the chang	jes your gover	nment is plan							
	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT		NOT SURE					
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance	MOST		LESS	ning:	NOT					
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on:	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT					
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT					
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT					
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT					
2.1 If YES, please rate the importance Greater focus on: Economic growth Poverty reduction Climate change and green growth Gender equality	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	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	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	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	MOST 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: The Swedish governing	MOST 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: The Swedish government of the swe	MOST 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: The Swedish government of the clearer in the c	MOST 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: The Swedish government of the clearer in the clearer in the clearer in the clear of the cous of t	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	noning: NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE					

В.	YOUR AID-FOR-TRAD	E FINANCIN	G							
DEM	1AND									
3.	3. HAS THE DEMAND FOR AID FOR TRADE FROM YOUR PARTNER COUNTRIES CHANGED SINCE 2008?									
SIGN	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: We have experienced an increase in demand from several countries and regions particularly in Africa and in relation to the EU-Africa Partnership Agreement negotiations. The requests fall within all categories of Aid for Trade but notably in trade capacity building, trade facilitation and areas related to quality infrastructure, namely SPS/TBT and other standards.										
4.	HAS THE DEMAND FO		TRADE FOR	REGIONAL I	NTEGRATI	ON PROGRA	MMES			
SIGN	IFICANTLY INCREASED	INCREASED	LITTL	E/NO CHANGE	DEC	CLINED	NOT SURE			
4.1	If the demand increase for trade: Again, we h in trade capacity buildin	nave seen an	increase fro	om several re	gions but r	otably in Afi	rica. Also			
		<u> </u>			, , ,	,				
RES	OURCES									
5.	HAVE YOUR AID-FOR	-TRADE RES	OURCES IN	CREASED SIN	ICE 2008?					
	YES 🔀		NO [NOT SURE	: 🔲			
		-			'					
6.	DOES YOUR AGENCY	HAVE INDIC	ATIVE FOR	WARD SPEN	DING PLAN	IS?				
	YES 🖂		NO [NOT SURE				
6.1.	If YES, do these forward	rd spending	plans includ	e estimates f	or aid for t	rade?				
	YES 🗌		NO ∑	1		NOT SURE				
6.2	If YES, please specify	these estima	ites:							
C.	IMPLEMENTING YOU	R AID-FOR-	TRADE STRA	ATEGY						
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			\boxtimes						
With	regional communities									
8.	8. IS THIS AN IMPROVEMENT COMPARED TO 2008?									

	SIGNIFICANT	MODERATE	LITTLE	/NONE	NOT SURI	E	NOT APPLICABLE		
With partner countries									
With regional communities	\boxtimes								
9. IS THE PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVED IN YOUR DIALOGUE?									
	ALWAYS	SOMET	IMES	RARE	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: In countries where private sector development is identified as a priority the private sector can be part of the dialogue. A good example is Tanzania where the dialogue resulted in the BEST-programme (-Business Environment Strengthening for Tanzania) where the target is povertyreduction in Tanzania through the development of small- and medium-sized businesses active in areas where there are many poor people. The Swedish government is working actively with an instensified co-operation with the private sector through various initiatives such as B4D (Business for Development). TRhe private sector can also be a part in the dialogue with for example the REC:s and regional banks.									
10. IS CIVIL SOCIETY INVO	OLVED IN VOL	B DIVIOCITES							
10. IS CIVIL SOCIETY INVO	ALWAYS	SOMET	INJEC	DADE	LY/NEVER		NOT SURE		
With partner countries	ALWATS	SOIVIET		NANE			NOT 30KE		
With partner countries With regional communities									
10.1 Please describe and p	rovido ovamala			dialog	us that inv	olyo			
civil society: Civil soci involved in programmes and (http://www.grolink.se/epo	ety may not alv projects. For e	ways be part o	f the gov	ernmen	nt policy dia	logi	ie but very		
11. ARE YOU HARMONIS WERE BEFORE 2008?		RATEGY WITH	OTHER I	OONOR	S BETTER N	IOW	/ THAN YOU		
SIGNIFICANTLY MODE	RATELY 🛛	RARELY/NEVER [NOT SUR	KE 🔲	NOT	APPLICABLE		
11.1 If you are harmonising	g better, how o	ften do you us	e the foll	lowing a	approaches	?			
	ALWAYS	SOMET	IMES	RARE	LY/NEVER		NOT SURE		
Joint needs assessment									
Co-financing									
Sector-wide approaches									
Joint implementation									
Common monitoring					\boxtimes				
Joint evaluation		\boxtimes							
Other									

Please specify: Sweden as part of the European Union is part of the donor coordination networks of the EU. Sweden is also aligning our strategy with the European Union Strategy on Aid for Trade. Harmonisation is a priority area and we are constantly trying to improve our dialogue with other donors, in some cases taken the lead in donor coordination as for example with the Joint Financing Agreement with UNECA . We are also aware of and actively working for more joint evaluation.

12. HAS ALIGNMENT O	F YOUR AID-	FOR-TI	RADE	PRO	GR/	MMA	E IMF	PROVE	D SINCE 20	08?
		SIGI	SIGNIFICANT		MODERATE		TE I	LITTLE/ NONE	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
With partner country priorit				\boxtimes						
With the Enhanced integrate							\boxtimes			
With regional priorities			\boxtimes							
Please elaborate with examples: The Swedish Development policy is formulated in multiannual regional and country strategies. In the formulation process of these strategies the partner country and regional commmunity is extensively involved in the formulation of areas and objectives for the strategy period. The strategy has the partner country's own PRS and DTIS as a starting point Sweden has increased the dialogue with different RECs, mainly in Africa in the past few years and the new regional strategy for Africa (adopted 2010) has put even more emphasis on Aid for Trade at a regional level in Africa.										
12.1. How many of your o	aid-for-trade	orograr	mmes	are	aligr	ned aı	rouna	l trade	priorities o	f?
	> 75%	75% -	50%	50	% - 2	5%	< 2	25%	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
Partner countries' development strategies										
The DTIS Action Matrix (for LDCs)										
Regional organisations development strategies										
13. HAS THE MONITOR	RING OF YOU	R AID-I	FOR-T	RAD	E PF	ROGR	RAMN	/IES IM	PROVED S	INCE 2008?
SIGNIFICANTLY	MODERAT	ELY 🛛			RARE	LY/NE	VER [NOT	SURE
13.1 If there have been i	improvement	s, how	often	do y	ou:					
			ALV	VAYS		SOME	ETIMES	S RA	RELY/NEVER	NOT SURE
Use your own monitoring							\boxtimes			
Rely on partner countries' monitoring processes			es 🗆				\boxtimes			
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 T	RADE WORK	ING?								
14 DOEC VOLUE ALD EC	D TDADE CT	DATEC	V DEE	INIT	CL E	AD 05		11/1503		
14. DOES YOUR AID-FO	NO [_	Y DEF	INE		OT SUR		IVES?	NOT AD	PLICABLE
IE3 🔼	NO [NC	1 JUK			NOT API	LICABLE

14.1 If YES, what are the objectives of your aid-for-trade strategy?						
	MOST IMPORTANT		PORTANT	LESS IMPORTA		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			\boxtimes			
Increased trade			\boxtimes			
Export diversification			\boxtimes			
Increased economic growth	\boxtimes					
Reduced poverty	\boxtimes					
Greater environmental sustainability			\boxtimes			
Greater gender equality						
Other						
Please specify:						
15. WHAT IS THE SHARE OF YOUR A QUANTIFIABLE OBJECTIVES?	AID FOR TRAI	DE PROG	RAMMES	THAT CO	NTAIN	
	25% 🖂 < 25% 🗌		NOT S	URE 🗌	NOT /	APPLICABLE
			I			
16. HAS YOUR GOVERNMENT EVAL OR PROJECTS?	UATED ITS A	ID-FOR-	TRADE STE	RATEGY, P	ROGR	AMMES
	YES		NO		NOT SURE	
Overall strategy						
Programmes and projects						
Both						
16.1 If YES, please provide a copy of ti	he(se) evaluat	tion(s) w	hen submi	tting this q	uestic	onnaire.
16.2 If NO, is your government planni	ng an evaluat	ion of its	s:			
	YES		N	0		NOT SURE
Overall strategy				3		
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		\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: PLEASE COMPARE THE CASE STORIES SUBMITTED								
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: THE WIDE SCOPE OF THE AID FOR TRADE CONCEPT STILL MAKES IT A CHALLENGE FOR BOTH DONOR AND PARTNER								

COUNTRIES TO UNDERSTAND IT. ANOTHER CHALLENGE IS TO ASSIGN OUTCOMES OF AID FOR TRADE PROGRAMMES THUS BEING ABLE TO ESTABLISH A LINK

BETWEEN POVERTY REDUCTION AND TRADE.