A. MANDATE

The Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration invited the WTO Director-General to create a Task Force to provide recommendations "on how to operationalize Aid for Trade" and "on how Aid for Trade might contribute most effectively to the development dimension of the DDA". It states that "Aid for Trade should aim to help developing countries, particularly LDCs, to build the supply-side capacity and trade-related infrastructure that they need to assist them to implement and benefit from WTO Agreements and more broadly to expand their trade. Aid for Trade cannot be a substitute for the development benefits that will result from a successful conclusion to the DDA, particularly on market access."

B. RATIONALE

Aid for Trade is about assisting developing countries to increase exports of goods and services, to integrate into the multilateral trading system, and to benefit from liberalized trade and increased market access. Effective Aid for Trade will enhance growth prospects and reduce poverty in developing countries, as well as complement multilateral trade reforms and distribute the global benefits more equitably across and within developing countries.

C. FINANCING

Additional, predictable, sustainable and effective financing is fundamental for fulfilling the Aid-for-Trade mandate. The effectiveness of the following recommendations for operationalizing Aid for Trade requires substantial additional targeted resources for trade-related programmes and projects as pledged at the WTO's Hong Kong Ministerial Conference, and against the background of the broader international commitment at the UN's Monterrey Conference and the G8 Summits in Gleneagles and St. Petersburg to significantly scale up development assistance by 2010. The Task Force urges the Director-General to seek confirmation from donors and agencies that funds are readily available for the implementation of the Aid-for-Trade initiative as part of his mandate to consult on "appropriate mechanisms to secure additional financial resources for Aid for Trade". In order to measure additionality and the adequacy of funding available to meet the Aid-for-Trade needs of developing countries, including those associated with a successful completion of the DDA, an account of what is being done today needs to be established as part of that process. The Task Force urges donors and agencies to provide the necessary information in order to make it possible for the Director-General to fulfil his mandate.

1 In Hong Kong, Japan announced development assistance spending on trade, production and distribution infrastructure of $10 billion over three years, the US announced Aid-for-Trade grants of $2.7 billion a year by 2010, and the EU and its member States announced trade-related development assistance spending of €2 billion per year by 2010.
D. **Scope**

The scope of Aid for Trade should be defined in a way that is both broad enough to reflect the diverse trade needs identified by countries, and clear enough to establish a border between Aid for Trade and other development assistance of which it is a part. Projects and programmes should be considered as Aid for Trade if these activities have been identified as trade-related development priorities in the recipient country’s national development strategies. In this regard, it should be pointed out that while the PRSPs\(^2\) reflect national development priorities for some countries, other development strategies are equally important and will need Aid-for-Trade financing. At the same time, clear and agreed benchmarks are necessary for reliable global monitoring of Aid-for-Trade efforts to assure accurate accounting and to assess additionality. The following categories, building upon the definitions used in the Joint WTO/OECD Database, have been identified:

1. **Trade policy and regulations, including:**
   
   Training of trade officials, analysis of proposals and positions and their impact, support for national stakeholders to articulate commercial interest and identify trade-offs, dispute issues, institutional and technical support to facilitate implementation of trade agreements and to adapt to and comply with rules and standards.

2. **Trade development, including:**
   
   Investment promotion, analysis and institutional support for trade in services, business support services and institutions, public-private sector networking, e-commerce, trade finance, trade promotion, market analysis and development.

3. **Trade-related infrastructure, including:**
   
   Physical infrastructure

4. **Building productive capacity**

5. **Trade-related adjustment, including:**
   
   Supporting developing countries to put in place accompanying measures that assist them to benefit from liberalized trade.

6. **Other trade-related needs**

   Reporting on categories (a) and (b) should follow the definitions in the Joint WTO/OECD Database. The activities that fall outside of the current Joint WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building Database definition, i.e. category (c), (d) (e) and (f) should be reported as Aid for Trade when these activities have been explicitly identified as trade-related priorities in the recipient country’s national development strategies, such as the PRSP.

---

\(^2\) Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) describe the macroeconomic, structural and social policies and programmes that a low income country will pursue over several years to promote broad-based growth and reduce poverty, as well as external financing needs and the associated sources of financing. They are country-led, country-written documents prepared by governments through a participatory process involving domestic stakeholders and external development partners, including the World Bank and the IMF.
E. CHALLENGES/GAPS

Since the start of the DDA in 2001, donors have stepped up their commitments on trade-related assistance. More developing countries are also integrating trade into their development strategies. But major challenges remain. These can include:

- Low attention to trade as a tool of development in recipient countries and in donor agencies.
- Insufficient trade mainstreaming in national development strategies and PRSPs.
- Lack of private-sector involvement in identifying trade needs.
- Limited absorptive capacity in recipient countries.
- Inadequate linking mechanisms and lack of predictability in donor response to trade priorities identified at the national and regional levels.
- Lack of coordination and coherence in donors' trade-related response.
- Slow, duplicative and bureaucratic processes in the assessment and delivery of trade assistance, including burdensome parallel structures within recipient countries.
- Lack of data on, and analysis of, trade policies and their impact on development, lack of easily-available information on existing Aid-for-Trade instruments.
- Ineffective monitoring of trade-related country policies and donor activities; absence of rigorous, independent project and programme evaluation and impact assessment.
- Limited support for regional, sub-regional and cross-border trade-related programmes and projects.
- Inadequate support to address the adjustment costs of trade liberalization.
- Insufficient resources for infrastructure and productive capacity building.
- Uneven country coverage.

F. OPERATIONALIZING AID FOR TRADE

F.1 Objectives

- To enable developing countries, particularly LDCs, to use trade more effectively to promote growth, development and poverty reduction and to achieve their development objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).
- To help developing countries, particularly LDCs, to build supply-side capacity and trade-related infrastructure in order to facilitate their access to markets and to export more.
- To help facilitate, implement, and adjust to trade reform and liberalization.
- To assist regional integration.
- To assist smooth integration into the world trading system
- To assist in implementation of trade agreements.

F.2 Guiding principles

Aid for Trade should be guided by the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, applicable to all parties involved (donors, agencies and beneficiaries), including key principles such as country ownership, mutual accountability, aligning aid to national development strategies, effective donor coordination, harmonization of donor procedures, use of programme-based aid modalities, managing for result, transparency, and predictable and multi-year commitments, which should be built into all programming. Aid for Trade should be rendered in a coherent manner taking full account, inter alia, of the gender perspective and of the overall goal of sustainable development. Administrative costs associated with the delivery of Aid for Trade should be minimized to ensure that the resources go to the actual implementation of identified priority projects and programmes. The competence and skills of the human resources available at national and regional levels should be used in an optimal way.
F.3 Strengthening the "demand side"

A commitment to country ownership and country-driven approaches – as well as a commitment of governments to fully mainstream trade into their development strategies – is key to the effectiveness of Aid for Trade. In some countries, the processes for mainstreaming trade into national development strategies, for formulating trade strategies, and for proposing priority trade projects for donor financing, need to be strengthened through technical assistance and capacity building to help developing countries put in place effective and sustainable trade policy frameworks and processes. Where consultative mechanisms already exist, they can be used – or improved upon. Value-chain analysis could be one valuable tool to identify trade needs.

*The Enhanced Integrated Framework (IF) for LDCs.* The purpose of the IF is to strengthen the LDCs' trade capacity, including the ability to identify their trade needs and to propose priorities to be supported by development partners. The recommendations on an enhanced IF, as agreed by the Integrated Framework Steering Committee (IFSC), will be an essential foundation for strengthening the demand-side of Aid for Trade in LDCs.

*Non-LDCs.* Many other developing countries also need support to mainstream trade into national strategies, to establish broad-based consultation processes involving the private sector, civil society organizations and relevant government agencies to formulate trade strategies, to develop action matrices, and to formulate priority project proposals.

*Regional needs.* Some of the constraints facing developing countries are regional, sub-regional or cross-border in nature. These needs should be identified and properly addressed. Regional organizations, including regional banks, regional integration organizations and regional economic communities, may play a role in assisting countries to identify such needs.

**Recommendations:**

- Implement the recommendations for an enhanced Integrated Framework.
- Establish effective national coordination, involving all relevant stakeholders, including the private sector, with a view to identifying the strengths and weaknesses of economies as a whole, and the particular challenges facing the trade sector.
- Explore the necessity of establishing a similar, but separately funded, in-country-process for non-LDCs "International Development Assistance (IDA)-only" countries, if such mechanisms do not already exist or can be improved upon.
- Urge agencies, donors and governments in other developing countries to work together to establish similar processes if they do not already exist. These processes should be modelled to the specific circumstances and needs of the country concerned, building on what already exists where possible and appropriate.
- Urge donors and agencies, together with regional banks and organizations, to step up their efforts to identify regional, sub-regional and cross-border needs, including those related to regional integration.
- Establish a system of data collection and analysis at country level.

F.4 Strengthening donor "response"

*Donor policies.* Donors should give more attention to trade issues in their aid programming and strengthen their trade expertise both in the field and at headquarters. There is a need for improved coordination of staff working across sectors and for greater trade mainstreaming in aid agencies' programmes.
**Donor coordination.** Greater donor and agency coordination and harmonization of procedures – at both the local and global level – is critical. Trade-related programmes and projects should be more coherent, both in terms of operations and policy.

**Donor response.** In allocating resources for Aid for Trade, donors and agencies should be guided by priority projects and programmes identified by developing countries, as well as by their potential merit in relation to the objectives for Aid for Trade. These priorities should be mirrored by donor and agency support. Each agency would need to determine how to deploy or reorient its financial and technical assistance to support either capacity building or accompanying measures related to trade liberalization.

**Recommendations:**

Donors and agencies should:

- integrate trade and growth issues more effectively in their aid programming;
- further strengthen their trade expertise both in the field and in capitals;
- use needs assessment processes (where available), and their results, as a basis for their programming;
- move towards a programme/sector/budget approach, if country owned, if mainstreamed in national development strategies and if a robust system of financial accountability is in place;
- make targeted funds available for building infrastructure and removing supply-side constraints – over and above capacity building and technical assistance – perhaps as co-financing with multilateral development banks; and
- consider channelling Aid-for-Trade Funds multilaterally, when appropriate.

**F.5 Strengthening the bridge between "demand" and "response"**

**F.5.1 Country level**

**Matching.** Strengthened in-country structures, with improved links to donor financing, are needed to help move from trade-related diagnostics to implementation, and to maximize access to multilateral and bilateral resources. The task of matching demand for Aid-for-Trade projects with response could be addressed by strengthening national coordination through a "National Aid-for-Trade Committee", which would include recipient countries, donors, and other relevant stakeholders, such as the private sector, under the leadership of relevant ministries. This committee should complement – not replace – existing PRSPs and other coordination mechanisms. If needed, this process could be supported by agencies that could serve as a clearing house.

**Mainstreaming trade.** Effectiveness in implementing Aid for Trade will depend on many actors working together in a coherent way. It will involve, for example, the World Bank, the IMF, regional development banks, UN agencies and donors at the national as well as the international level, and trade, agriculture, development and finance ministries at the national level. It is the responsibility of donors, agencies and recipients to do their part in reforming how those entities integrate trade into development and national strategies.

**South-South cooperation.** Technical cooperation among developing countries is a valuable tool to deliver effective results because of their common experience and understanding of the challenges they face. The valuable technical expertise of the South could be used to implement projects through triangular schemes of cooperation.
Private sector. As actors in the field, private enterprises are well placed to identify trade-related problems and bottlenecks. An increased dialogue between the public sector and private entrepreneurs would improve effectiveness in assessing Aid-for-Trade needs, in diagnostics, and in implementation, as well as in evaluating effectiveness in implementation.

Recommendations:

- Recipient countries should mainstream trade into national strategies, such as PRSPs, formulate trade strategies, and propose priority trade projects for donor financing.
- The division of responsibility for funding and implementing Aid-for-Trade projects and programmes should be addressed through country-based processes such as PRSPs or Consultative Groups, if necessary complemented with a partner conference focusing specifically on trade-related support, convened once countries have integrated trade into their national strategies.
- A National Aid-for-Trade Committee could be established, where necessary, to ensure trade mainstreaming in national development strategies, determine country needs, set priorities, assist in matching "demand" and "response", and help in evaluation. Tasks could include identifying co-financing or leveraging funds from other larger funds, as well as assessing adjustment needs and brokering financing for such programmes. Recipient countries could request agencies to perform a coordinating role.
- Partners should commit to contributing to the implementation of trade strategies and identified priority projects and programmes. The resulting plan should incorporate a results-based management framework resting on – and reinforcing – mutual accountability. Indicators of progress should be agreed.
- Promote the involvement of local, regional and private-sector actors, as well as South-South cooperation through triangular schemes.

F.5.2 Regional level

Many countries require cross-border infrastructure and regional policy cooperation to trade more effectively. The ability to identify cross-border and regional needs should be strengthened at the country, regional and multilateral level. Once needs have been identified, donors and agencies must improve their ability to respond. In particular, assistance in formulating and financing accompanying measures could help to make regional integration an effective building block for the multilateral trading system. At the forthcoming September Development Committee Meeting, strengthening support for regional, sub-regional and cross-border needs will be discussed.

Recommendations:

- Strengthen the following functions in relation to regional, sub-regional and cross-border issues:
  - diagnosis of needs;
  - costing of projects;
  - preparation of project proposals; and
  - the coordination of donor response, including brokering and co-financing of needs that at present are difficult to finance through country-based processes, (e.g., cross-border infrastructure and policy-integration projects).
- Assign responsibility for these functions. In doing so, priority should be given to improving and strengthening existing mechanisms, including those at the multilateral and regional level, before considering a new mechanism. In exploring the most efficient solution, the conclusions from the discussions at the forthcoming Development Committee should be taken
into account. Any solution should involve all relevant stakeholders and give priority to existing regional integration programmes that lack funding.

- Explore the merits of establishing a Regional Aid-for-Trade Committee, comprising sub-regional and regional organizations and financial institutions, to oversee the implementation of the sub-regional and regional dimensions of Aid for Trade, to report on needs, responses and impacts, and to oversee monitoring and evaluation.

F.5.3 Global level

A number of tasks in relation to Aid for Trade are best performed at the global level. These include:

**Data collection.** Lack of empirical data has made it difficult to examine the relationship between policies related to trade and development performance. Better data and statistics are a precondition for better understanding the process of globalization and its impact, and for determining priorities for development cooperation.

**Knowledge creation and sharing.** Dissemination of Aid-for-Trade evaluation results, development of best practices and guidelines, and facilitation of information sharing, involving all relevant actors, needs to be improved at the global level, in order to assure efficient use of Aid-for-Trade funds.

**Channelling donor funding.** Some donors might wish to direct Aid-for Trade funds through multilateral channels, which would allow them to support Aid for Trade without having to build their own institutional capacity in this area and without getting involved at country level. This could include providing support for processes similar to the IF for non-LDC IDA-only countries.

**Matching.** While a clearing-house function should in most cases be performed at the country and the regional level, sessions dedicated to specific themes and groups of countries could be periodically organized to provide a platform for donors and developing countries to discuss specific gaps which may occur in the implementation of Aid for Trade. One important function could be to connect outstanding Trade-Related Assistance (TRA) needs to donors willing to contribute to their fulfilment.

**Recommendations:**

- Strengthen the following functions in relation to global issues:
  - the collection and analysis of data on trade policies and their impact, the facilitation of knowledge sharing, and the development of guidelines. Funding for such activities needs to be secured;
  - provision of information on existing Aid-for-Trade instruments and expertise; and
  - matching and brokering unfunded TRA-needs and available donor funding for such projects and programmes.
- Assign responsibility for these functions. In doing so, priority should be given to improving and strengthening existing mechanisms before considering the establishment of a new clearing house at the global level.

F.6 Strengthening monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluating progress is essential in building confidence that increased Aid for Trade will be delivered and effectively used. It will also provide strong incentives to both donors and recipients to advance the Aid-for-Trade agenda. It is important to emphasize the need for concrete and
Visible results on the ground. All the providers of Aid for Trade and the recipient countries have the responsibility to report on progress and results.

**Monitoring.** In recipient countries, monitoring should cover trade mainstreaming in national strategies, such as PRSPs, the identification of priority needs, donor responses, progress in implementing trade-related projects and programmes as well as the impact of these efforts. Donors who have made commitments to Aid for Trade should report on the content of such commitments as well as on how they plan to meet the targets for Aid for Trade that they have announced.

**Evaluation.** Rigorous Aid-for-Trade programme evaluation is particularly important because projected significant increases in Aid for Trade may stretch the delivery capacity of donors and the absorptive capacity of recipients. In-depth country-impact evaluations of Aid-for-Trade programmes should be undertaken to build knowledge and facilitate a results-based approach to delivery. Evaluation of in-country processes should focus, *inter alia*, on progress in mainstreaming trade in national development plans. Evaluations should adopt a results-based approach in order to ensure effectiveness of Aid-for-Trade programmes in relation to the objectives.

**Recommendations:**

- A global periodic review of Aid for Trade should be convened by a monitoring body in the WTO, based on reports from several different sources, to be published if feasible on the WTO web page:
  - from the country level;
  - from donors;
  - from the regional level;
  - from relevant multilateral agencies; and
  - from the private sector.
- Mechanisms to facilitate reporting to the global monitoring body should be enhanced, including the possibility of a notification process for WTO Members.
- The global periodic reviews should be followed by an annual debate on Aid for Trade convened in the WTO General Council to give political guidance on Aid for Trade.
- Recipient countries should report on the trade mainstreaming in national development strategies, such as the PRSPs, the formulation of trade strategies, Aid-for-Trade needs, donor responses, and implementation and impact. The primary responsibility for reporting to the global monitoring body would lie with the National Aid-for-Trade Committee.
- Donors should report on funds dedicated for Aid for Trade, how they intend to meet their announced Aid-for-Trade targets, the Aid-for-Trade categories covered, and their progress in mainstreaming trade into their aid programming.
- Multilateral and regional actors should be encouraged to report regularly on their Aid-for-Trade activities, progress and impact. When appropriate these actors – including the OECD/DAC – should be asked to assist in providing input and in the organization of the periodic Aid-for-Trade review in the WTO.
- The private-sector should be provided an opportunity to report on their Aid for Trade contributions.
- An assessment of Aid for Trade – either as a donor or as a recipient – should be included in the WTO Trade Policy Reviews.
- Evaluation of country-needs identification, trade mainstreaming in national strategies and PRSPs, donor response and impact on the ground in relation to stated objectives, should be promoted and funded.
- The scope of the Joint WTO/OECD Database should be reviewed in light of the Task Force's definition of Aid for Trade. It should also be updated based on more accurate identification of needs (and the responses) by both providers and recipients of Aid for Trade.
G. **HOW AID FOR TRADE CAN CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT DIMENSION OF THE DOHA-Round**

Aid for Trade is important in its own right. It should assist developing countries to benefit from increased trade opportunities multilaterally (both from previous rounds and from the anticipated results of the DDA), regionally, bilaterally and unilaterally. The Task Force therefore recommends that Aid for Trade must be operationalized as soon as possible. At the same time, the Task Force affirms that Aid for Trade is a complement, not a substitute, for a successful Doha Round. Increasing trade opportunities for developing countries, in particular the least-developed among them, remains the most important contribution that the WTO can make to development. A successful conclusion of the Round will increase the need for assistance to implement new agreements (e.g., Trade Facilitation), to ease adjustment costs, and to make use of new market access. Aid for Trade is a complement to the Doha Round, but it is not conditional upon its success.

H. **NEXT STEPS**

These recommendations are directed to many different actors. The Task Force suggests the following next steps:

- urges Members to expeditiously implement the recommendations of the Task Force.
- urges the Director-General to use these recommendations in pursuing his mandate to consult on "appropriate mechanisms to secure additional financial resources for Aid for Trade" so that the joint mandate in Paragraph 57 of the Hong Kong Declaration can be implemented in a holistic manner.
- invites the Director-General to communicate these recommendations to relevant agencies and organizations and to urge Ministers at the upcoming Development Committee Meeting in Singapore to give consideration to these recommendations and to encourage the Bank and the Fund to ensure adequate follow-up and to report on the results at the 2007 Annual meeting.
- invites the Director-General to continue, under his coherence mandate, a dialogue on how recommendations targeted at the agencies could be implemented, including where responsibility for implementation should lie.
- invites the Director-General to establish an ad hoc consultative group to take forward the practical follow-up of these recommendations.
- invites the Director-General to begin examining how to implement the recommendations regarding WTO monitoring of Aid for Trade.
- invites the Director-General to convene, at an appropriate time, an initial review of Aid for Trade, with the participation of all relevant stakeholders.
- suggests, after the completion of the DDA, that the Secretariat conduct an assessment of associated Aid-for-Trade needs in developing countries, particularly those most affected, including LDCs, and of how Aid for Trade can contribute to the development dimension of the DDA.

Annexes:

- Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness
- Joint WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building Database
- Paragraph 57 of the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration
ANNEX 1

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability

I. Statement of Resolve

1. We, Ministers of developed and developing countries responsible for promoting development and Heads of multilateral and bilateral development institutions, meeting in Paris on 2 March 2005, resolve to take far-reaching and monitorable actions to reform the ways we deliver and manage aid as we look ahead to the UN five-year review of the Millennium Declaration and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) later this year. As in Monterrey, we recognise that while the volumes of aid and other development resources must increase to achieve these goals, aid effectiveness must increase significantly as well to support partner country efforts to strengthen governance and improve development performance. This will be all the more important if existing and new bilateral and multilateral initiatives lead to significant further increases in aid.

2. At this High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, we followed up on the Declaration adopted at the High-Level Forum on Harmonisation in Rome (February 2003) and the core principles put forward at the Marrakech Roundtable on Managing for Development Results (February 2004) because we believe they will increase the impact aid has in reducing poverty and inequality, increasing growth, building capacity and accelerating achievement of the MDGs.

Scale up for more effective aid

3. We reaffirm the commitments made at Rome to harmonise and align aid delivery. We are encouraged that many donors and partner countries are making aid effectiveness a high priority, and we reaffirm our commitment to accelerate progress in implementation, especially in the following areas:

i. Strengthening partner countries’ national development strategies and associated operational frameworks (e.g., planning, budget, and performance assessment frameworks).

ii. Increasing alignment of aid with partner countries’ priorities, systems and procedures and helping to strengthen their capacities.

iii. Enhancing donors’ and partner countries’ respective accountability to their citizens and parliaments for their development policies, strategies and performance.

iv. Eliminating duplication of efforts and rationalising donor activities to make them as cost-effective as possible.

v. Reforming and simplifying donor policies and procedures to encourage collaborative behaviour and progressive alignment with partner countries’ priorities, systems and procedures.

vi. Defining measures and standards of performance and accountability of partner country systems in public financial management, procurement, fiduciary safeguards and environmental assessments, in line with broadly accepted good practices and their quick and widespread application.

4. We commit ourselves to taking concrete and effective action to address the remaining challenges, including:
i. Weaknesses in partner countries’ institutional capacities to develop and implement results-driven national development strategies.

ii. Failure to provide more predictable and multi-year commitments on aid flows to committed partner countries.

iii. Insufficient delegation of authority to donors’ field staff, and inadequate attention to incentives for effective development partnerships between donors and partner countries.

iv. Insufficient integration of global programmes and initiatives into partner countries’ broader development agendas, including in critical areas such as HIV/AIDS.

v. Corruption and lack of transparency, which erode public support, impede effective resource mobilisation and allocation and divert resources away from activities that are vital for poverty reduction and sustainable economic development. Where corruption exists, it inhibits donors from relying on partner country systems.

5. We acknowledge that enhancing the effectiveness of aid is feasible and necessary across all aid modalities. In determining the most effective modalities of aid delivery, we will be guided by development strategies and priorities established by partner countries. Individually and collectively, we will choose and design appropriate and complementary modalities so as to maximise their combined effectiveness.

6. In following up the Declaration, we will intensify our efforts to provide and use development assistance, including the increased flows as promised at Monterrey, in ways that rationalise the often excessive fragmentation of donor activities at the country and sector levels.

Adapt and apply to differing country situations

7. Enhancing the effectiveness of aid is also necessary in challenging and complex situations, such as the tsunami disaster that struck countries of the Indian Ocean rim on 26 December 2004. In such situations, worldwide humanitarian and development assistance must be harmonised within the growth and poverty reduction agendas of partner countries. In fragile states, as we support state-building and delivery of basic services, we will ensure that the principles of harmonisation, alignment and managing for results are adapted to environments of weak governance and capacity. Overall, we will give increased attention to such complex situations as we work toward greater aid effectiveness.

Specify indicators, timetable and targets

8. We accept that the reforms suggested in this Declaration will require continued high-level political support, peer pressure and coordinated actions at the global, regional and country levels. We commit to accelerate the pace of change by implementing, in a spirit of mutual accountability, the Partnership Commitments presented in Section II and to measure progress against 12 specific indicators that we have agreed today and that are set out in Section III of this Declaration.

9. As a further spur to progress, we will set targets for the year 2010. These targets, which will involve action by both donors and partner countries, are designed to track and encourage progress at the global level among the countries and agencies that have agreed to this Declaration. They are not intended to prejudice or substitute for any targets that individual partner countries may wish to set. We have agreed today to set five preliminary targets against indicators as shown in Section III. We agree to review these preliminary targets and to adopt targets against the remaining indicators as shown in Section III before the UNGA Summit in September 2005; and we ask the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC to prepare for this urgently. Meanwhile, we welcome initiatives

3 In accordance with paragraph 9 of the Declaration, the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) comprising OECD/DAC members, partner countries
by partner countries and donors to establish their own targets for improved aid effectiveness within the framework of the agreed Partnership Commitments and Indicators of Progress. For example, a number of partner countries have presented action plans, and a large number of donors have announced important new commitments. We invite all participants who wish to provide information on such initiatives to submit it by 4 April 2005 for subsequent publication.

Monitor and evaluate implementation

10. Because demonstrating real progress at country level is critical, under the leadership of the partner country we will periodically assess, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, our mutual progress at country level in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness. In doing so, we will make use of appropriate country level mechanisms.

11. At the international level, we call on the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC to broaden partner country participation and, by the end of 2005, to propose arrangements for the medium term monitoring of the commitments in this Declaration. In the meantime, we ask the partnership to co-ordinate the international monitoring of the Indicators of Progress included in Section III; to refine targets as necessary; to provide appropriate guidance to establish baselines; and to enable consistent aggregation of information across a range of countries to be summed up in a periodic report. We will also use existing peer review mechanisms and regional reviews to support progress in this agenda. We will, in addition, explore independent cross-country monitoring and evaluation processes – which should be applied without imposing additional burdens on partners – to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how increased aid effectiveness contributes to meeting development objectives.

12. Consistent with the focus on implementation, we plan to meet again in 2008 in a developing country and conduct two rounds of monitoring before then to review progress in implementing this Declaration.

II. Partnership Commitments

13. Developed in a spirit of mutual accountability, these Partnership Commitments are based on the lessons of experience. We recognise that commitments need to be interpreted in the light of the specific situation of each partner country.

OWNERSHIP

Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies, and strategies and co-ordinate development actions

14. Partner countries commit to:

and multilateral institutions, met twice, on 30-31 May 2005 and on 7-8 July 2005 to adopt, and review where appropriate, the targets for the twelve Indicators of Progress. At these meetings an agreement was reached on the targets presented under Section III of the present Declaration. This agreement is subject to reservations by one donor on (a) the methodology for assessing the quality of locally-managed procurement systems (relating to targets 2b) and 5b) and (b) the acceptable quality of public financial management reform programmes (relating to target 5a.ii). Further discussions are underway to address these issues. The targets, including the reservation, have been notified to the Chairs of the High-level Plenary Meeting of the 59th General Assembly of the United Nations in a letter of 9 September 2005 by Mr. Richard Manning, Chair of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC).
• Exercise leadership in developing and implementing their national development strategies through broad consultative processes.
• Translate these national development strategies into prioritised results-oriented operational programmes as expressed in medium-term expenditure frameworks and annual budgets (Indicator 1).
• Take the lead in co-ordinating aid at all levels in conjunction with other development resources in dialogue with donors and encouraging the participation of civil society and the private sector.

15. **Donors** commit to:

• Respect partner country leadership and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it.

**ALIGNMENT**

Donors base their overall support on partner countries’ national development strategies, institutions and procedures

**Donors align with partners’ strategies**

16. **Donors** commit to:

• Base their overall support — country strategies, policy dialogues and development co-operation programmes — on partners’ national development strategies and periodic reviews of progress in implementing these strategies (Indicator 3).
• Draw conditions, whenever possible, from a partner’s national development strategy or its annual review of progress in implementing this strategy. Other conditions would be included only when a sound justification exists and would be undertaken transparently and in close consultation with other donors and stakeholders.
• Link funding to a single framework of conditions and/or a manageable set of indicators derived from the national development strategy. This does not mean that all donors have identical conditions, but that each donor’s conditions should be derived from a common streamlined framework aimed at achieving lasting results.

**Donors use strengthened country systems**

17. Using a country’s own institutions and systems, where these provide assurance that aid will be used for agreed purposes, increases aid effectiveness by strengthening the partner country’s sustainable capacity to develop, implement and account for its policies to its citizens and parliament. Country systems and procedures typically include, but are not restricted to, national arrangements and procedures for public financial management, accounting, auditing, procurement, results frameworks and monitoring.

18. Diagnostic reviews are an important — and growing — source of information to governments and donors on the state of country systems in partner countries. Partner countries and donors have a shared interest in being able to monitor progress over time in improving country systems. They are assisted by performance assessment frameworks, and an associated set of reform measures, that build on the information set out in diagnostic reviews and related analytical work.

---

4 The term ‘national development strategies’ includes poverty reduction and similar overarching strategies as well as sector and thematic strategies.

5 This includes for example the Annual Progress Review of the Poverty Reduction Strategies (APR).
19. **Partner countries** and **donors** jointly commit to:

- Work together to establish mutually agreed frameworks that provide reliable assessments of performance, transparency and accountability of country systems (**Indicator 2**).
- Integrate diagnostic reviews and performance assessment frameworks within country-led strategies for capacity development.

20. **Partner countries** commit to:

- Carry out diagnostic reviews that provide reliable assessments of country systems and procedures.
- On the basis of such diagnostic reviews, undertake reforms that may be necessary to ensure that national systems, institutions and procedures for managing aid and other development resources are effective, accountable and transparent.
- Undertake reforms, such as public management reform, that may be necessary to launch and fuel sustainable capacity development processes.

21. **Donors** commit to:

- Use country systems and procedures to the maximum extent possible. Where use of country systems is not feasible, establish additional safeguards and measures in ways that strengthen rather than undermine country systems and procedures (**Indicator 5**).
- Avoid, to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programmes (**Indicator 6**).
- Adopt harmonised performance assessment frameworks for country systems so as to avoid presenting partner countries with an excessive number of potentially conflicting targets.

**Partner countries strengthen development capacity with support from donors**

22. The capacity to plan, manage, implement, and account for results of policies and programmes, is critical for achieving development objectives — from analysis and dialogue through implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Capacity development is the responsibility of partner countries with donors playing a support role. It needs not only to be based on sound technical analysis, but also to be responsive to the broader social, political and economic environment, including the need to strengthen human resources.

23. **Partner countries** commit to:

- Integrate specific capacity strengthening objectives in national development strategies and pursue their implementation through country-led capacity development strategies where needed.

24. **Donors** commit to:

- Align their analytic and financial support with partners’ capacity development objectives and strategies, make effective use of existing capacities and harmonise support for capacity development accordingly (**Indicator 4**).
Strengthen public financial management capacity

25. Partner countries commit to:
   - Intensify efforts to mobilise domestic resources, strengthen fiscal sustainability, and create an enabling environment for public and private investments.
   - Publish timely, transparent and reliable reporting on budget execution.
   - Take leadership of the public financial management reform process.

26. Donors commit to:
   - Provide reliable indicative commitments of aid over a multi-year framework and disburse aid in a timely and predictable fashion according to agreed schedules (Indicator 7).
   - Rely to the maximum extent possible on transparent partner government budget and accounting mechanisms (Indicator 5).

27. Partner countries and donors jointly commit to:
   - Implement harmonised diagnostic reviews and performance assessment frameworks in public financial management.

Strengthen national procurement systems

28. Partner countries and donors jointly commit to:
   - Use mutually agreed standards and processes\(^6\) to carry out diagnostics, develop sustainable reforms and monitor implementation.
   - Commit sufficient resources to support and sustain medium and long-term procurement reforms and capacity development.
   - Share feedback at the country level on recommended approaches so they can be improved over time.

29. Partner countries commit to take leadership and implement the procurement reform process.

30. Donors commit to:
   - Progressively rely on partner country systems for procurement when the country has implemented mutually agreed standards and processes (Indicator 5).
   - Adopt harmonised approaches when national systems do not meet mutually agreed levels of performance or donors do not use them.

Untie aid: getting better value for money

31. Untying aid generally increases aid effectiveness by reducing transaction costs for partner countries and improving country ownership and alignment. DAC Donors will continue to make progress on untying as encouraged by the 2001 DAC Recommendation on Untying Official Development Assistance to the Least Developed Countries (Indicator 8).

---

\(^6\) Such as the processes developed by the joint OECD-DAC – World Bank Round Table on Strengthening Procurement Capacities in Developing Countries.
HARMONISATION
Donors’ actions are more harmonised, transparent and collectively effective

Donors implement common arrangements and simplify procedures

32. **Donors** commit to:
   - Implement the donor action plans that they have developed as part of the follow-up to the Rome High-Level Forum.
   - Implement, where feasible, common arrangements at country level for planning, funding (e.g. joint financial arrangements), disbursement, monitoring, evaluating and reporting to government on donor activities and aid flows. Increased use of programme-based aid modalities can contribute to this effort (**Indicator 9**).
   - Work together to reduce the number of separate, duplicative, missions to the field and diagnostic reviews (**Indicator 10**); and promote joint training to share lessons learnt and build a community of practice.

Complementarity: more effective division of labour

33. Excessive fragmentation of aid at global, country or sector level impairs aid effectiveness. A pragmatic approach to the division of labour and burden sharing increases complementarity and can reduce transaction costs.

34. **Partner** countries commit to:
   - Provide clear views on donors’ comparative advantage and on how to achieve donor complementarity at country or sector level.

35. **Donors** commit to:
   - Make full use of their respective comparative advantage at sector or country level by delegating, where appropriate, authority to lead donors for the execution of programmes, activities and tasks.
   - Work together to harmonise separate procedures.

Incentives for collaborative behaviour

36. **Donors** and **partner countries** jointly commit to:
   - Reform procedures and strengthen incentives—including for recruitment, appraisal and training— for management and staff to work towards harmonisation, alignment and results.

Delivering effective aid in fragile states

37. The long-term vision for international engagement in fragile states is to build legitimate, effective and resilient state and other country institutions. While the guiding principles of effective aid

---

7 The following section draws on the draft Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States, which emerged from the Senior Level Forum on Development Effectiveness in Fragile States (London, January 2005).
apply equally to fragile states, they need to be adapted to environments of weak ownership and capacity and to immediate needs for basic service delivery.

38. **Partner countries** commit to:

- Make progress towards building institutions and establishing governance structures that deliver effective governance, public safety, security, and equitable access to basic social services for their citizens.
- Engage in dialogue with donors on developing simple planning tools, such as the transitional results matrix, where national development strategies are not yet in place.
- Encourage broad participation of a range of national actors in setting development priorities.

39. **Donors** commit to:

- Harmonise their activities. Harmonisation is all the more crucial in the absence of strong government leadership. It should focus on upstream analysis, joint assessments, joint strategies, co-ordination of political engagement; and practical initiatives such as the establishment of joint donor offices.
- Align to the maximum extent possible behind central government-led strategies or, if that is not possible, donors should make maximum use of country, regional, sector or non-government systems.
- Avoid activities that undermine national institution building, such as bypassing national budget processes or setting high salaries for local staff.
- Use an appropriate mix of aid instruments, including support for recurrent financing, particularly for countries in promising but high-risk transitions.

**Promoting a harmonised approach to environmental assessments**

40. Donors have achieved considerable progress in harmonisation around environmental impact assessment (EIA) including relevant health and social issues at the project level. This progress needs to be deepened, including on addressing implications of global environmental issues such as climate change, desertification and loss of biodiversity.

41. **Donors** and **partner countries** jointly commit to:

- Strengthen the application of EIAs and deepen common procedures for projects, including consultations with stakeholders; and develop and apply common approaches for “strategic environmental assessment” at the sector and national levels.
- Continue to develop the specialised technical and policy capacity necessary for environmental analysis and for enforcement of legislation.

42. Similar harmonisation efforts are also needed on other cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality and other thematic issues including those financed by dedicated funds.

**MANAGING FOR RESULTS**

**Managing resources and improving decision-making for results**

43. Managing for results means managing and implementing aid in a way that focuses on the desired results and uses information to improve decision-making.
44. **Partner countries** commit to:
   - Strengthen the linkages between national development strategies and annual and multi-annual budget processes.
   - Endeavour to establish results-oriented reporting and assessment frameworks that monitor progress against key dimensions of the national and sector development strategies; and that these frameworks should track a manageable number of indicators for which data are cost-effectively available (**Indicator 11**).

45. **Donors** commit to:
   - Link country programming and resources to results and align them with effective partner country performance assessment frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that are not consistent with partners’ national development strategies.
   - Work with partner countries to rely, as far as possible, on partner countries’ results-oriented reporting and monitoring frameworks.
   - Harmonise their monitoring and reporting requirements, and, until they can rely more extensively on partner countries’ statistical, monitoring and evaluation systems, with partner countries to the maximum extent possible on joint formats for periodic reporting.

46. **Partner countries** and **donors** jointly commit to:
   - Work together in a participatory approach to strengthen country capacities and demand for results based management.

**MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

*Donors and partners are accountable for development results*

47. A major priority for partner countries and donors is to enhance mutual accountability and transparency in the use of development resources. This also helps strengthen public support for national policies and development assistance.

48. **Partner countries** commit to:
   - Strengthen as appropriate the parliamentary role in national development strategies and/or budgets.
   - Reinforce participatory approaches by systematically involving a broad range of development partners when formulating and assessing progress in implementing national development strategies.

49. **Donors** commit to:
   - Provide timely, transparent and comprehensive information on aid flows so as to enable partner authorities to present comprehensive budget reports to their legislatures and citizens.

50. **Partner countries** and **donors** commit to:
• Jointly assess through existing and increasingly objective country level mechanisms mutual progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness, including the Partnership Commitments. (Indicator 12).

III. Indicators of Progress
To be measured nationally and monitored internationally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OWNERSHIP</strong></th>
<th><strong>TARGET FOR 2010</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Partners have operational development strategies — Number of countries with national development strategies (including PRSs) that have clear strategic priorities linked to a medium-term expenditure framework and reflected in annual budgets.</td>
<td>At least 75% of partner countries have operational development strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ALIGNMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>TARGETS FOR 2010</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Reliable country systems — Number of partner countries that have procurement and public financial management systems that either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.</td>
<td>(a) Public financial management – Half of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., 0.5 points) on the PFM/ CPIA (Country Policy and Institutional Assessment) scale of performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Procurement – One-third of partner countries move up at least one measure (i.e., from D to C, C to B or B to A) on the four-point scale used to assess performance for this indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Aid flows are aligned on national priorities — Percent of aid flows to the government sector that is reported on partners’ national budgets.</td>
<td>Halve the gap — halve the proportion of aid flows to government sector not reported on government’s budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Strengthen capacity by co-ordinated support — Percent of donor capacity-development support provided through coordinated programmes consistent with partners’ national development strategies.</td>
<td>50% of technical co-operation flows are implemented through co-ordinated programmes consistent with national development strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PERCENT OF DONORS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5a</strong> Use of country public financial management systems – Percent of donors and of aid flows that use public financial management systems in partner countries, which either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.</td>
<td>3.5 to 4.5</td>
<td>90% of donors use partner countries’ PFM systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PERCENT OF AID FLOWS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5+</strong> A two-thirds reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems</td>
<td>3.5 to 4.5</td>
<td>A one-third reduction in the % of aid to the public sector not using partner countries' PFM systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PERCENT OF DONORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Use of country procurement systems – Percent of donors and of aid flows that use partner country procurement systems which either (a) adhere to broadly accepted good practices or (b) have a reform programme in place to achieve these.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strengthen capacity by avoiding parallel implementation structures – Number of parallel project implementation units (PIUs) per country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aid is more predictable – Percent of aid disbursements released according to agreed schedules in annual or multi-year frameworks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aid is untied – Percentage of bilateral aid that is untied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HARMONISATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TARGETS FOR 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th>MANAGING FOR RESULTS</th>
<th>TARGET FOR 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Use of common arrangements or procedures – Percent of aid provided as programme-based approaches</td>
<td>66% of aid flows are provided in the context of programme-based approaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Encourage shared analysis – Percent of (a) field missions and/or (b) country analytic work, including diagnostic reviews that are joint.</td>
<td>(a) 40% of donor missions to the filed are joint. (b) 66% of country analytical work is joint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TARGET FOR 2010</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mutual accountability – Number of partner countries that undertake mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments on aid effectiveness including those in this Declaration.</td>
<td>All partner countries have mutual assessment reviews in place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important Note:** In accordance with paragraph 9 of the Declaration, the partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) comprising OECD/DAC members, partner countries and multilateral institutions, met twice, on 30-31 May 2005 and on 7-8 July 2005 to adopt, and review where appropriate, the targets for the twelve Indicators of Progress. At these meetings an agreement was reached on the targets presented under Section III of the present Declaration. This agreement is subject to reservations by one donor on (a) the methodology for assessing the quality of locally-managed procurement systems (relating to targets 2b and 5b) and (b) the acceptable quality of public financial management reform programmes (relating to target 5a.ii). Further discussions are underway to address these issues. The targets, including the reservation, have been notified to the Chairs of the High-level Plenary Meeting of the 59th General
Assembly of the United Nations in a letter of 9 September 2005 by Mr. Richard Manning, Chair of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC).

*Note on Indicator 5: Scores for Indicator 5 are determined by the methodology used to measure quality of procurement and public financial management systems under Indicator 2 above.

**APPENDIX A:**
Methodological Notes on the Indicators of Progress

The Indicators of Progress provide a framework in which to make operational the responsibilities and accountabilities that are framed in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. This framework draws selectively from the Partnership Commitments presented in Section II of this Declaration.

**Purpose** — The Indicators of Progress provide a framework in which to make operational the responsibilities and accountabilities that are framed in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. They measure principally **collective behaviour at the country level.**

**Country level vs. global level** — The indicators are to be measured at the country level in close collaboration between partner countries and donors. Values of country level indicators can then be statistically aggregated at the **regional or global level.** This global aggregation would be done both for the country panel mentioned below, for purposes of statistical comparability, and more broadly for all partner countries for which relevant data are available.

**Donor / Partner country performance** — The indicators of progress also provide a **benchmark against which individual donor agencies or partner countries can measure their performance** at the country, regional, or global level. In measuring individual donor performance, the indicators should be applied with flexibility in the recognition that donors have different institutional mandates.

**Targets** — The targets are set at the global level. Progress against these targets is to be measured by aggregating data measured at the country level. In addition to global targets, partner countries and donors in a given country might agree on country-level targets.

**Baseline** — A baseline will be established for 2005 in a panel of self-selected countries. The partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) is asked to establish this panel.

**Definitions and criteria** — The partnership of donors and partner countries hosted by the DAC (Working Party on Aid Effectiveness) is asked to provide specific guidance on definitions, scope of application, criteria and methodologies to assure that results can be aggregated across countries and across time.

**Note on Indicator 9** — Programme based approaches are defined in Volume 2 of Harmonising Donor Practices for Effective Aid Delivery (OECD, 2005) in Box 3.1 as a way of engaging in development cooperation based on the principles of co-ordinated support for a locally owned programme of development, such as a national development strategy, a sector programme, a thematic programme or a programme of a specific organisation. Programme based approaches share the following features: (a) leadership by the host country or organisation; (b) a single comprehensive programme and budget framework; (c) a formalised process for donor co-ordination and harmonisation of donor procedures for reporting, budgeting, financial management and procurement; (d) Efforts to increase the use of local systems for programme design and implementation, financial
management, monitoring and evaluation. For the purpose of indicator 9 performance will be measured separately across the aid modalities that contribute to programme-based approaches.

APPENDIX B:
List of Participating Countries and Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo D.R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To be confirmed.

More countries than listed here have endorsed the Paris Declaration. For a full and up to date list please consult www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/parisdeclaration/members.
## Participating Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>Commonwealth Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest (CGAP)</td>
<td>Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)</td>
<td>Education for All Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)</td>
<td>European Investment Bank (EIB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria</td>
<td>G24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Fund (IMF)</td>
<td>International Organisation of the Francophonie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Development Bank</td>
<td>Millennium Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD)</td>
<td>Nordic Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)</td>
<td>Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC Fund for International Development</td>
<td>Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Development Group (UNDG)</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Civil Society Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa Humanitarian Action</td>
<td>AFRODAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundations</td>
<td>Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement (CCFD)</td>
<td>Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité (CIDSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comisión Económica (Nicaragua)</td>
<td>ENDA Tiers Monde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EURODAD</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation (JANIC)</td>
<td>Reality of Aid Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania Social and Economic Trust (TASOET)</td>
<td>UK Aid Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2

Joint WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building Database

The Trade Capacity Building Database (TCBDB) has been established by the WTO jointly with the OECD to provide information on trade-related technical assistance and capacity building projects. It covers national as well as regional projects. It is an on-going activity and the 2005 Joint WTO/OECD Report on Trade-Related Technical Assistance and Capacity Building was circulated in December 2005. At present, the period of coverage is 2001 to 2004 and partial 2005 and beyond. Data is reported from bilateral donors and multilateral/regional Agencies.

Trade-related Technical Assistance and Capacity Building Categories

1. Trade Policy and Regulations

Dispute Settlement
Customs Valuation
Technical Barriers to Trade
Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures
Trade Mainstreaming in PRSPs/development plans
Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights
Agriculture
Services
Tariff Negotiations - Non-Agricultural Market Access
Rules
Trade and Environment
Trade and Investment
Trade and Competition
Trade Facilitation
Transparency and Government Procurement
Accession
Tariff Reforms
Trade-Related Training Education
Negotiation Training
Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs)

2. Trade and Development

Trade Promotion Strategy Design and Implementation
Market Analysis and Development
Business Support Services and Institutions
Public-Private Sector Networking
E-commerce
Trade Finance

3. Infrastructure

Infrastructure – data from the OECD Creditor Reporting System

---

8 http://tcdbdb.wto.org
Paragraph 57 of the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration  
(WT/MIN(05)/DEC)

"We welcome the discussions of Finance and Development Ministers in various fora, including the Development Committee of the World Bank and IMF, that have taken place this year on expanding Aid for Trade. Aid for Trade should aim to help developing countries, particularly LDCs, to build the supply-side capacity and trade-related infrastructure that they need to assist them to implement and benefit from WTO Agreements and more broadly to expand their trade. Aid for Trade cannot be a substitute for the development benefits that will result from a successful conclusion to the DDA, particularly on market access. However, it can be a valuable complement to the DDA. We invite the Director-General to create a task force that shall provide recommendations on how to operationalize Aid for Trade. The Task Force will provide recommendations to the General Council by July 2006 on how Aid for Trade might contribute most effectively to the development dimension of the DDA. We also invite the Director-General to consult with Members as well as with the IMF and World Bank, relevant international organisations and the regional development banks with a view to reporting to the General Council on appropriate mechanisms to secure additional financial resources for Aid for Trade, where appropriate through grants and concessional loans.”