

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

RESTRICTED

WT/IFSC/6/Rev.2/Add.1

3 December 2003

(03-6433)

Integrated Framework Steering Committee

FINAL REPORT OF THE EVALUATION OF THE INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK

SUMMARY

Addendum

This document contains the summary of the Final Report of the second Evaluation of the Integrated Framework for Trade-related Technical Assistance to the Least-developed Countries (IF). It is an addendum to the full Final Report circulated as document WT/IFSC/6/Rev.2.

**Evaluation of the Revamped Integrated Framework
For Trade-related Technical Assistance
to the Least-Developed Countries**

Project GLO/03/G01

Summary
of the Final Report

Presented to

The Integrated Framework Steering Committee

Prepared by

Capra-TFOC Consortium
(Capra International Inc. and
Trade Facilitation Office Canada)

November 2003

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the findings of the *Final Report on Evaluation of the Revamped Integrated Framework [IF] for Trade-Related Technical Assistance to the Least-Developed Countries [LDC]* (October 2003) and addresses comments made by representatives of core agencies, donor and LDCs, both orally and in writing¹, at the IF Steering Committee meeting on October 27, 2003. The findings regarding the evaluation elements specified in the *Statement of Work* and in the *Terms of Reference*, which are diffused throughout the final Evaluation Report, are referenced to their respective sections in the *Final Report* in Table 1 [pp. 21-24].

The Report Structure

The Final Evaluation Report. The full Final Report was designed to facilitate reading at two levels: (1) as an integrated whole, or (2) as free-standing parts, on a country-by-country or issue-by-issue basis. To accommodate both interests, the Report's recommendations are numbered both within each free-standing part and sequentially, as well as in groups. The grouped recommendations appearing in this *Summary*, reference in square brackets the sequentially numbered recommendations, which are contained in the Final Report. Individual sections within the report are structured to identify: (1) the evaluation context, as drawn from the *Logical Framework Analysis* (Annex A); (2) a description of the evaluation findings; (3) a brief interpretation of the significance of the findings; (4) a discussion of potential adjustments; (5) a visualization of the potential impact of adjustments; and (6) recommendations. Specific recommendations on who should do what and when have been avoided, since such aspects can only be fully addressed after key issues of perception, approach and capacity have been dealt with.

The Summary Report. In the course of the review of the Final Report, both donor and agency representatives wondered how much additional *time* might be required, if certain recommendations were implemented, as for example, the greater use of local consultants, more extensive local participation and more capacity development. To estimate the time requirements broadly, this report adds brief notes on *Possible Implementation Options*, a feature that did not appear in the full Final Report. Building on these notes, a typical time requirement is then estimated for those options where the Evaluators have international data. It must be noted, however, that in actual practice, implementation time-lines may vary significantly from LDC to LDC, for a number of good reasons. Regardless of additional time requirements, the long-term effectiveness of IF must be considered, which may be diminished, if certain necessary investments in time are not made. A further concern expressed by agency and donor representatives relates to *priorities* in implementing change. Again, this Summary Report contains suggestions for priority ranking, a feature that was not addressed in the full Final Report.

¹ Responses to comments are woven into the text of the Summary Report, without identifying the source. In a few cases, it was not possible to address comments precisely due to their generality or their apparent reference to IF as an instrument, rather than to aspects of the evaluation.

The Approach to the Evaluation

The approach to the evaluation was the best that could be done in the extremely short period of time available to the Evaluators, which was about half of the seven months initially contemplated in the Terms of Reference.

While the primary purpose of the evaluation was the assessment of *results*, it was evident that it was too early to look for measurable *developmental results* in terms of poverty reduction attributable to increased trade and economic growth. Therefore the evaluation focused on *operational results*, but even for these, the lack of measurable goals and objectives, and hence quantitative performance indicators, imposed serious limitations on what could be done in the short available timeframe. Based on documents that had been provided to the Evaluators, these constructed a potential *Logical Framework Analysis* (Annex A), which assisted them in the design of the approach to the Evaluation.

The *Fundamental Evaluation Issues* were: (1) The extent to which increased trade can be reasonably expected to contribute to poverty reduction in LDCs; (2) which conditions must exist to ensure that increased trade will benefit the poor; and (3) the IF's achievement of expected results of mainstreaming trade into development, i.e. the issues relating to the *Doha Development Agenda*.

The *Specific Evaluation Issues* were: (1) The level of awareness of the IF among stakeholders²; (2) the stakeholders' understanding of IF objectives; (3) the stakeholders' expectations from IF; (4) the stakeholders' motivation and level of preparation to cooperate; (5) the implementation of IF in terms of success factors and barriers; (6) the governance of IF in terms of the adequacy of the IF management structure; and (7) learning from IF, in terms of recommendations.

On the premise that the IF is LDC-driven, the initial *contact* was with the IF Focal Point, and, when required, with representatives of core agencies, Lead Donors/Facilitators, and in some cases local Chambers of Commerce. In particular, these contact person had been asked to identify the local IF stakeholders³, that should be involved in the evaluation, including governmental officials, the private sector, academia and civil society, as well as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Even though six field consultants had been made available to undertake the evaluation in a multilingual environment (English, French, Arabic), who were supported by a *Panel of Experts* consisting of seven members, many key informants were not available to participate, since the two-day⁴ country visits had to be forced into a rigid timeframe, in many cases during the peak holiday season.

Against the backdrop of the Evaluators' *Logical Framework Analysis* (Annex A), the Evaluators undertook both secondary and primary research. The *secondary research* consisted of both a document and literature review and a preliminary analysis of available statistical data regarding poverty and fiscal capacity, i.e. two indicators, the significance of which should be further assessed in terms of governance indicators. The *primary research* was conducted using (1) interviews, focus groups and other meetings, based on an *Interview and Focus Group Guide*, to ascertain the views of core agencies, selected donors and representatives of LDCs in Geneva, Washington, New York,

² As for the assessment of *awareness*, it should be noted that since the Focal Points selected the IF participants in the evaluation, it is assumed that the best informed individuals were chosen, if they were available at the time of evaluation. It follows from that assumption, that a low level of awareness may mean that either the level of awareness is truly low, calling for better communication, or that the Evaluators did not have access to better informed individuals, for whatever reasons. Low awareness was also noted among the few contacts with regional development banks that were possible.

³ The list of actual contacts, which includes all of these categories, has not been published in the Report, under pledge of confidentiality to the participants.

⁴ The highly compressed timeframe for country visits, of only two days each, permitted a fairly general assessment, but largely precluded the formulation of extensive specific recommendations aimed at improving the LDC-based IF.

Brussels, London and 17 LDCs, plus telephone interviews with representatives of another LDC, as well as (2) an *invitational electronic survey* (Annex E).

Due to the time constraints it was only possible to conduct an *electronic survey*, which obviously limited the number of participants to those who could access the Internet. Had more time been available, a parallel mail-in survey might have been attempted to reach those who lack Internet access. Since the electronic survey resulted in a relatively small sample size, LDC responses were grouped for analysis. It should also be noted that the survey questions were designed to look at both perceived actual results and potential performance. The survey resulted in key findings regarding awareness and understanding of the IF, expectations from IF, as well as implementation and governance of IF.

The Summary Finding

In overall terms, the evaluation revealed that considerable progress has been made, especially at the agency and planning levels, but *fine-tuning* is required to move to a robust implementation stage, where concrete in-country results can be achieved within more countries.

With regard to general progress, the Evaluators noted with satisfaction the fundamental soundness of the IF approach, which they expressed in the *First Evaluation Issue* relating to *Trade and Poverty*, and, in particular, to its premise that, *all other factors being equal, poverty should decline as the level and extent of socio-economic intervention increases*.

In reporting their findings, the Evaluators also noted what they considered to be the most essential *ingredients of success*. These include: (1) a *Logical Framework* (see Annex A) in which expected results are clearly defined in terms of short-term outputs, medium-term outcomes and long-term impacts, which are then transformed into a prioritized Action Plan; (2) a high level of political support for introducing change; (3) an adequately resourced Focal Point, at the centre of a network of local stakeholders, agencies and donors; (4) effective capacity development (see Annex G); and (5) throughout the IF system (agencies, donors, LDCs), individuals who are committed to the IF objectives.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE FINE-TUNED?

The Evaluators have identified two other *Evaluation Issues* as well as eight *broad programmatic areas*, where fine-tuning is critical to the success of the IF.

Two Evaluation Issues

Second Evaluation Issue. One of these other two *Evaluation Issues* addresses the question *when trade will benefit the poor*. In *macro* terms, the answer is that trade will only benefit the poor in an LDC, if *governance* provides for political inclusiveness and greater social development. What good governance means has been summarized in the six World Bank criteria of: Voice and accountability; political stability and absence of violence; Government effectiveness; regulatory quality; rule of law; and control of corruption.

In *micro* terms, trade benefits the poor, when, in designing DTIS, a conscious effort is made to include potential export products, produced by the poor, in a pro-poor environment. To make that possible, it may be necessary to work hand in glove with the PRSP processes early in the introduction of IF to an LDC. Some of the PRSP initiatives entail a wonderful World Bank tool, that of *poverty mapping*. Basically a poverty map is grounded in the premise that in rich and poor countries alike there may be significant pockets where poverty is concentrated. To reduce poverty effectively and efficiently planners should not, and cannot, ignore some targeting of their efforts.

Third Evaluation Issue. The third and last *Evaluation Issue*, calling for fine-tuning, relates to *mainstreaming of trade into development*. The Evaluators noted, and the Donors in their comments stressed, that a critical area, in which some LCDs are underachieving, is the extent of the LDC *participatory* environment, which needs to be strengthened, along with certain broad programmatic areas, as discussed below.

What about the eight broad programmatic areas in which fine-tuning is perceived to be necessary?

Eight Broad Programmatic Areas

1. IF Scope

The first of these is the question of *IF Scope* to clarify differences of *perception*, with special reference to the issue of *supply-side constraints*? How big is IF, or how big should it be? The Evaluators noted, and the Donors also pointed this out, that there appears to be a divergence of opinion between the donors and several LDCs with respect to supply-side constraints. The fundamental issue is whether IF should be a broad funding source, or whether it should remain to be a relatively small mechanism to help member countries identify their strengths and weakness, and particularly their quantified needs for funding, which are then presented to donors with a request for funding from a variety of sources. The Evaluators recommend that the IFSC develop a guideline on the issue of IF scope and that the LDCs, in requesting the reduction of supply-side constraints, weigh the associated costs and benefits in relation to their other trade and development priorities.

Grouped Recommendations

- 4.1.1 *It is recommended that the IFSC develop Guidelines to establish the limits of IF-defined activities, including the scope, coverage and parameters of supply-side constraints.* [See Recommendations 29, 95 and 96.]

- 4.1.2 *It is recommended that countries implementing the IF pay particular attention to the cost and benefits of supply-side constraint projects and weigh these against their expected results. [See Recommendation 97]*

Possible Implementation Options

- Option 1: If the decision is to provide direct IF funding to reduce supply-side constraints, then it may be desirable to establish a separate fund for that purpose, in order not to threaten highly effective less costly IF core activities that may have lesser political appeal.
- Option 2: If the decision is not to provide direct IF funding to reduce supply-side constraints, then the Action Plan Matrices might be used to develop funding request packages for presentation to donors, in two categories: (1) regular IF and (2) funding to diminish supply-side constraints.

2. Country Selection

The second broad programmatic area requiring fine-tuning, relates to *country selection*. From the perspective of the LDCs, the predominant concern appears to be the perception that country selection is not sufficiently objective and transparent. To address this issue, the Evaluators recommend that the IFSC develop, and widely publicize, an objective and transparent country selection process.

The Evaluators also recommend the use of an objective filtering process, comprising *macro, meso* and *micro* features. The precise nature of these filters needs to be carefully considered to achieve both effectiveness and efficiency of operation, while noting the potential limitations of the political considerations impacting on the selection process.

Fundamental to country selection, it is important, from a *macro* perspective, to clarify the *grounds for selection*: Should IF favour (1) the selection of countries offering a high rate of return for an investment of effort, or (2) countries that are most needy of assistance in their development process? Depending on the IF members' choice, the results flowing from the selection will differ. If the IF members find it difficult to define the grounds for selection, due to political aspects, then, as a minimum response, the selected country should be classified, after the fact, as to type, since that will assist in defining realistic expected results.

In the context of country selection, the question arose whether the IF approach in general, and the DTIS process in particular, should be extended beyond LDCs. This is essentially a resource issue, as well as one of focus. While it could be done, especially as some low income countries are probably better positioned to benefit more quickly from the IF, it would require a substantially larger financial contribution from the international community, and a much strengthened and enlarged Secretariat. Given the number of potentially eligible countries, much stricter adherence to selection criteria would be required, which could even lead to the exclusion of LDCs for whom the IF was created in the first place. The Evaluators would consider such an outcome to be undesirable.

Grouped Recommendation

- 4.2.1 *It is recommended that the IFWG develop, and widely publicize, an objective and transparent country selection process, using macro, meso and micro filters. [See Recommendations 65; 83; 84.]*

Possible Implementation Options

- Option 3: If the decision is to use a macro filter, identify either an in-house specialist, trained in statistics, or a contractor, to develop a methodology based on the conclusions in Annex D, to track annually the macro LDC secondary data on poverty, GDP and governance, with a view to ranking potential IF candidate LDCs. Under either approach, the use of this filter is relatively low cost and requires a minuscule investment in time.
- Option 4: If the decision is to use a meso filter, there may be an alternative to the use of a pre-selection DTIS-Lite, which had been suggested in the Final Report. That alternative would be the preparation of a *country profile* based on available economic and social secondary data. Such a profile, like the macro filter in Option 1, would require relatively little cost and time to prepare. As in the case of the macro filter, this work could be executed by an in-house statistician or by a contractor.
- Option 5: There is no doubt, as confirmed in donor comments, that the micro filter is of critical importance, since it will ascertain the extent of *political will* and *readiness* of the country to assume IF-related leadership. This filter would incorporate, to a considerable extent, the substance of the existing initial assessment mission and concept paper.

3. LDC Participation and Ownership

The third broad programmatic area requiring fine-tuning, relates to *LDC participation and ownership*. While country ownership is a primary criterion for ultimate IF success, participation, buy-in and commitment in LDCs vary greatly. Where country ownership is weak, IF development is weak. Where country ownership is strong, the IF flourishes. All LDCs should be encouraged to ensure as broad participation as possible. In the case of new LDCs, the extent of planned participation may well be an important element for country selection.

The criteria for LDC country ownership encompass: (1) Senior level government commitment, i.e. political will; (2) a fully equipped IF Focal Point (human and financial resources); (3) the establishment of, and membership on, the *National Steering Committee*; (4) local leadership in the DTIS⁵ and *Action Plan Matrix* processes; (5) local consultant selection; (6) an *Action Plan Matrix* that is manageable and indicatively costed, as an LDC's tool for the solicitation of donor support; and (6) LDC control over projects to be executed within their countries. Many LDCs want more direct initial participation in all phases of IF planning.

Grouped Recommendations

- 4.1.3 *It is recommended that IF officials, who promote the IF in existing and new IF countries, ensure that they obtain senior level government commitment to the IF before making any commitments for IF support.* [See Recommendations 14 and 46.]

⁵ In that context, every effort should be made to encourage the production of leaner and better focused DTIS. There should be less emphasis on priority sectors and more attention to overall *exporter* support and development.

- 4.1.4 *It is recommended that the IF Focal Point be equipped with sufficient human and financial resources to be able to manage the IF initiative effectively, including communication, task distribution within different government offices and document preparation for donor solicitation. [See Recommendations 8, 15, 23; 28, 34, 48, 51, 59.]*
- 4.1.5 *It is recommend that the IFSC develop a Guideline on the Meaning and Extent of Country Ownership and Participation in the IF Process, including: (a) the establishment of and membership on the National Steering Committee [NSC], including pro-poor representation; (b) local leadership in the DTIS and Action Plan Matrix processes; and (c) local consultant selection. [See Recommendations 1, 4, 5, 20, 25, 26, 29, 36, 37, 42, 44, 49, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 71, 88.]*
- 4.3.4 *It is recommended that the Action Plan Matrix be developed in such a way that it serves as a manageable and indicatively costed work programme. [See Recommendation 60.]*
- 4.3.5 *It is recommended that, after LDCs have identified their trade-related priorities and needs, the country open a competition inviting the cooperation agencies to “bid” on their areas of expertise and interest, while the country selects the sectors or projects, which will be attended by those agencies, this being an approach that can foster a sense of national dignity and ownership. [See Recommendation 31.]*
- 4.3.6 *It is recommended that Agencies and Donors increase coordination at the national level. [See Recommendations 32, 36, 56.]*

Possible Implementation Options

The achievement of country participation and ownership depends on many variables, not the least on some of the broad programmatic areas that are discussed below. Nevertheless, the following process options are of critical importance.

Option 6: IF implementation should be *responsive*. That means that an LDC that has been selected should be allowed to advance *at its own pace*. IF agencies and donors should *respond* to the extent that LDCs are ready to advance by offering timely and effective support in terms of technical advice, guidance and funding, as needed. Agencies and donors should not rush LDCs, since that would imply that the LDCs serve agency and donor interests, rather than the other way around. If an LDC perceives a value in IF for improving its socio-economic advantages and the quality of life of its citizenry, then, it will want to benefit as quickly as possible. This option will likely require more time than external interventions, but it should not require greater budgetary resources. These may even be less!

Option 7: To foster LDC participation and ownership, IF implementation should be undertaken in a *learning environment*, where the LDC owners of the process are allowed to make mistakes, without being penalized. Experience has shown that participation and ownership in a learning environment is more important to ultimate success than achieving a high degree of technical quality in outputs that were produced by outsiders. Such a learning environment may be achieved using *Action Learning* principles, as discussed in Annex G. The implementation of *Action Learning* requires the training and use of an *Action Learning Facilitator*. A suitably trained and locally

based Donor Facilitator may be the best person for that role. The estimated duration of a training workshop is two to three days.

- Option 8: To assist agency and donor representatives in responding to LDCs in a learning environment, it may be helpful to develop an *IF Facilitator Tool Kit* comprising implementation checklists and other resources, such as a model for a *Results-Based Management* (RBM) planning matrix.

4. Consultant Selection

The fourth broad programmatic area requiring fine-tuning relates to *consultant selection*. There is a widespread perception that current practices of consultant selection result in “doing it for them” instead of “doing it with them”. Obviously, local consultants have to be qualified. If the requirements can be clearly defined in terms of necessary abilities to do the work, it should be possible to rate local people against these requirements and involve them to the extent that they are fully or partially qualified. International consultants might be invited to pick up the slack, and, in general terms, provide mentoring and coaching support. As the old adage has it, it is better to teach a man to fish than to feed him fish. Having said that, it should be noted that *mentoring* may be far more challenging and time consuming than *delivering* the final product, but this extra effort must be viewed as an effective investment in long-term development.

Grouped Recommendations

- 4.4.1 *It is recommended that the IFSC issue a Guideline on IF Consulting, with a view to attracting and developing more fully or partially qualified local people capable of undertaking assignments or contracts for IF-related research and implementation studies, whereby international consultants would predominantly perform mentoring and coaching functions, as required.* [See Recommendations 86, 89, 91, 98, 99.]
- 4.4.2 *It is recommended that the IFWG develop and maintain an IF-related consultant database comprising both local and international consultants.* [See Recommendation 92.]

Possible Implementation Options

- Option 9: Convene a system-wide *DACUM workshop*, as discussed in Annex G of the Final Report, to define and document in a *DACUM profile* the sub-occupational or sub-professional as well as personal competencies or skills which are required to execute a DTIS study. Per competency area, such a workshop and subsequent development work, including preparation and travel would normally require about three weeks. Each workshop would also require the participation of five to eight experienced practitioners under the leadership of an experienced DACUM Facilitator⁶, as well as one or two subject matter experts for subsequent development.
- Option 10: Use the *DACUM profile* (Option 9) as a recruitment tool to assess the skills of available local consultants, using documentary screening and interview techniques⁷; then recruit those local consultants that appear to be able to demonstrate some or all of the required skills, complementing these, to the extent necessary to overcome

⁶ Outside Canada, full DACUM training programmes have been delivered in at least ten countries, including: Argentina; Bénin; Brazil; Burkina Faso; Chile; Palestine; Finland; Mali; Mexico; and South Africa.

⁷ If desired, such a simplified approach can be enhanced by means of standard *Prior Learning Assessment* techniques.

knowledge or skill gaps, by qualified international consultants, who will act as coaches. Standard recruitment timeframes apply.

5. Planning, Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

The fifth broad programmatic area requiring fine-tuning, relates to *planning, management, monitoring and evaluation*. There is a perception that: (1) IF is a series of free-standing activities, assigned and controlled by outsiders, without necessarily associating trade-related development with poverty reduction; i.e. the focus seems to be on activities rather than results; (2) the DTIS tend to be too generic and often lack a pro-poor dimension; and (3) the *Action Plan Matrices*, generally lack prioritization. In addition, other improvements should be made to enhance planning, management, monitoring and evaluation.

The fundamental recommendation to address the area of planning, management, monitoring and evaluation urges the adoption of a *Results-Based Management* [RBM] process. While some donors wondered whether RBM might be burdensome for some LDCs, that should not be the case. RBM is not an imposed super-model that everyone has to follow. The process is as simple or as complex as a given LDC desires. It is a tool that each LDC can choose to adopt. Fundamentally, the RBM approach entails the following: (1) Decide where you want to go, or in RBM terms, which specific results do I want to achieve? (2) What do I have to do to get there, in terms of activities and strategies? (3) How do I know when I have arrived, i.e. are there any indicators against a baseline? (4) Whom do I need to help me get there, i.e. what are the human resource requirements? And (5), how much will it cost, i.e. the budget or funding requests presented to donors? The answers to these questions are what participating LDCs decide they want to do. IF facilitators should *accompany* the LDCs to where they want to go to reduce poverty, at the pace they want to go, allowing them to do some things *their way*.

If an RBM approach is adopted, this will facilitate the availability of a DTIS follow-up mechanism at the local level as well as mainstreaming of the IF within agencies and donors. Some valuable donor roles in that regard were noted in the report of the Hague workshop.⁸

The RBM approach generally, and the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA), in particular, is also most helpful in anticipating risks, such as changing government priorities and declining interest in IF. Since both the RBM and LFA are readily changeable, these tools would also be ideal for the design of an *exit strategy*.

It should be noted that the reach of RBM can be considerably broader than just IF, by ultimately influencing public management practices throughout LDCs. If that should happen, then IF-based use of RBM will have been instrumental in stimulating greater accountability and better governance in participating LDCs.

RBM is now a central programme tool in the Canadian International Development Agency. In many cases, developing countries cannot even submit a proposal without doing a *Logical Framework Analysis*, which is the heart of the RBM process! A model of what that might be is contained in Annex A of the Evaluation Report.

If the participating LDCs choose to operate IF under an RBM approach, they should also be the *managers* leading the monitoring process. *Performance criteria* would be defined in accordance with a *Logical Framework Analysis* and *benchmarks* would be based on historical LDC experience.

⁸ *The Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance: The Role of Donors. Report of a workshop.* 28-29 April 2003.

One of the more general recommendations in the areas of planning, management, monitoring and evaluation calls for the development of a simple, consistent and replicable data framework for the dimensions of poverty, fiscal capacity and governance.

Grouped Recommendations

- 4.5.1 *It is recommended that the IFSC adopt a Results-Based Management (RBM) Approach to define the expected results of poverty reduction attributable to trade in terms of long-term impacts, medium-term outcomes and short-term outputs, in order to facilitate effective, efficient and integrated planning, management, monitoring and evaluation throughout the IF system. [See Recommendations 6, 12, 21, 40, 50, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 80, 81, 82, 102, 103, 105.]*
- 4.5.2 *It is recommended that the data source for operational monitoring of IF progress be a Results-Based Management (RBM) system. [See Recommendation 108.]*
- 4.5.3 *It is recommended that IF managers in LDCs be responsible (1) for monitoring expected results, in accordance with agreed-upon performance criteria, as well as (2) for reporting of these to LDC stakeholders, core agencies and donors. [See Recommendation 106.]*
- 4.5.4 *It is recommended that the IF be more communicative, efficient and transparent on funds management at the country level, providing clear definitions on budget allocation and identifying sources of funding [Malawi]. [See Recommendation 38.]*
- 4.5.5 *It is recommended that IF performance criteria be defined in the context of a Logical Framework Analysis (LFA), reflecting LDC, core agency and donor requirements. [See Recommendation 107.]*
- 4.5.6 *It is recommended that Benchmarks be defined in terms of historical LDC experience with the IF, grounded in a Results-based Management (RBM) system. [See Recommendation 109, 113.]*
- 4.5.7 *It is recommended that the data source for periodic evaluations be twofold, (1) the data derived from a Results-Based Management (RBM) system and (2) secondary research data. [See Recommendation 110.]*
- 4.5.8 *It is recommended that the development of a simple, consistent and replicable data framework for the dimensions of poverty, fiscal capacity and governance be developed, which is an essential component of a country selection and monitoring framework. [See Recommendation 111.]*

Possible Implementation Options

- Option 11: Conduct a one-day *Results-Based Management* (RBM) orientation workshop for the members of the IFSC, IFWG and the IF Secretariat, including all Geneva-based LDC representatives. As *one* example of such a workshop, the CIDA model may be viewed on the Internet.⁹
- Option 12: Repeat the RBM orientation workshop (Option 11) in each LDC, with the participation of the IF Focal Point, the members of the National Steering Committee (NSC) or appropriate representatives of government, the private sector, academia and civil society, if an NSC has not yet been established, as well as the IF agency and donor representatives.
- Option 13: In each LDC choosing to adopt the RBM approach, select a small group (at least two) of dedicated officials who will facilitate the implementation of RBM and the corresponding monitoring process, providing additional pre-assignment training, if desired, these persons to be known as *RBM Facilitators*.
- Option 14: Under the leadership of the RBM Facilitators (Option 13), create an *Action Learning* (see Annex G of the Final Report) environment within the National Steering Committee and relevant sub-committees to facilitate the effective introduction and application of RBM, including the definition of a *Logical Framework* (for a model see Annex A of the Final Report).
- Option 15: The RBM Facilitators draft *performance indicators* and *benchmarks* on the basis of the Logical Framework (Option 14) and other appropriate data and seek a consensus for their approval by the IF Focal Point, National Steering Committee as well as IF agency and donor representatives.
- Option 16: The RBM Facilitators manage the RBM-based monitoring processes and ensure timely reporting to the NSC, who, in turn, report the monitoring results to the IF Focal Point, and through the Focal Point, to the agency and donor community, as well as other LDC-based stakeholders in the IF process.
- Option 17: The LDC-based IF agency and/or donor representatives act as mentors or coaches on RBM-related matters, if requested by the LDC to do so.
- Option 18: The IF Focal Point commissions necessary periodic *secondary research* that may be required for the development of a simple, consistent and replicable data framework for the dimensions of poverty, fiscal capacity and governance, as well as for periodic evaluations.

⁹ http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/cida_ind.nsf/0/daa38a8fb771568985256c5600191ddc?OpenDocument

6. Capacity Development

The sixth of the eight broad programmatic areas, requiring fine-tuning, relates to *capacity development*. The Evaluators found that LDC leadership capacity varies greatly across LDCs. These findings concern both local consultants and the IF community, in general.

In general terms, the Evaluators recommend addressing capacity development along the lines of *competency-based* approaches. Basically that means, as discussed in Annex G of the Final Report, that: (1) input is provided by a group of individuals who are actual *practitioners*; (2) it is *consensus-based*, i.e. each competency statement is the reflection of a consensus reached by the practitioners; and (3) the approach is *application-oriented* and phrased in such a way that it will be measurable and/or observable.

This process also allows for the use of *prior learning assessment*. It provides total flexibility in terms of learning environment, learning speed, etc. It is perfect for training people with diverse backgrounds and learning ability, since it focuses on what they can *do*.

The Evaluators also recommend that training of this type be offered *at all levels*, including the Focal Point, the National Steering Committee and other public and private stakeholders.

Various specific recommendations address overall governance direction, training contents, training methodology, and the use of mentors.

Grouped Recommendations

- 4.6.1 *It is recommended that the IFSC issue a Guideline on IF-related Capacity Development, Mentoring and Assistance, with a view to increasing the capacity of local consultants and IF managers and capitalizing upon the opportunity to develop in-country skills and competency for the long-run benefit of the IF and the LDC client.* [See Recommendations 90, 99, 100, 112.]
- 4.6.2 *It is recommended, with respect to training contents, that the following elements be included: (1) the capacity to manage the IF itself; (2) the application of Results-Based Management (RBM) for planning, monitoring and evaluation; (3) the roles, tasks and responsibilities of each stakeholder; (4) WTO negotiations and accession activities; and (5) communication skills.* [See Recommendations 24, 43, 52, 102, 104.]
- 4.6.3 *It is recommended, with respect to training participants, that the following groups be offered training, among both current and future LDCs participating in IF: (1) local stakeholders, including the IF Focal Point, government officials; (2) potential local consultants; (3) regional and local enterprises; (4) exporters.* [See Recommendations 11, 13, 35, 41, 43, 58, 87, 104.]
- 4.6.4 *It is recommended that the training methodology be competency based.* [See Recommendation 23 and Annex G.]
- 4.6.5 *It is recommended that mentors be drawn, to the extent possible, from: (1) local core agency representatives and (2) the lead donor facilitator.* [See Recommendation 3, 45.]
- 4.6.6 *It is recommended that the operation of JITAP and IF be harmonized in countries where both offer their services and that their resources be used in a coordinated way*

and that similar approaches be used for the coordination of IF and other local plans.
[See Recommendation 10, 32, 39.]

Possible Implementation Options

- Option 19: Convene an integrated series of system-wide *DACUM workshops*, as discussed in Annex G of the Final Report (also see Option 9), to define and document in *DACUM profiles* the competencies or skills which are required for the *administration of the IF in an LDC*. One workshop each would be conducted to cover the functions of: (1) the IF Focal Point; (2) members of the National Steering Committee; and (3) LDC-based agency and donor representatives. The time requirement and practitioner support would be as described in Option 9.
- Option 20: Based on the DACUM Profiles for LDC-based IF administration (Option 19), and with the participation of JITAP trainers, design an *orientation programme*, comprising expected learning outcomes and corresponding instructional objectives, curriculum contents, as well as instructional methods based on adult learning principles, including independent learning, and suitable for use in a variety of appropriate media.
- Option 21: Offer *orientation training* (based on Option 20) to the three target groups upon their appointment: (1) IF Focal Points; (2) members of the National Steering Committee; and (3) LDC-based agency and donor representatives.
- Option 22: Convene a system-wide 1-2 day planning workshop to define the criteria for the development of a coherent *Exporter Development Programme*, with the participation of JITAP, Trade Facilitation Office Canada, the Forum of International Trade Training¹⁰ and the DACUM Facilitator(s) (Options 9, 19, 20).
- Option 23: With the participation of JITAP, Trade Facilitation Office Canada, the Forum of International Trade Training and the DACUM Facilitators, develop a *catalogue of suitable available courses*, as well as a list of new courses that need to be developed, indicating the identity of recommended course developers, together with development criteria and timelines.
- Option 24: After establishing IF working groups of any kind, foster *learning on the job*, using *Action Learning* techniques (see Annex G of the Final Report).

7. Communication

The seventh of the eight broad programmatic areas, requiring fine-tuning, relates to *communication*. One of the major *risks* in any undertaking, the IF included, is that communication with stakeholders may be insufficient to assure effective buy-in.

Various communication-related recommendations have been offered, the main ones being (1) the creation of a *Communication Unit* within the IF Secretariat and (2) the establishment of a *Focal Point Network*.

A *communication strategy* should be designed for the system as a whole and within each participating LDC, identifying carefully: (1) the specific communication objectives; (2) the target audiences (and they vary, as for example government officials, exporters, civil society, etc.); (3) discrete themes;

¹⁰ <http://www.fitt.ca>

(4) within each theme several distinct messages; and (5) the preferred media, such as letters, pamphlets, meetings, the Internet, etc.

Grouped Recommendations

- 4.7.1 *It is recommended that a dedicated Information Unit within the IF Secretariat be established.* [See Recommendation 53, 76.]
- 4.7.2 *It is recommended that an IF LDC Focal Point Network be established.* [See Recommendation 77.]
- 4.7.3 *It is recommended that an information strategy be designed, comprising: (1) communication objectives (see Recommendation 7, 9, 11, 27); (2) targeted audiences (see Recommendation 7, 9, 47, 79, 85, 93, 94); (3) discrete themes and messages (see Recommendation 7, 27, 47, 54, 85, 94); and (4) media.* [See Recommendation 7, 27, 79.]
- 4.7.4 *It is recommended that good practices and lessons learned in successful experiences be disseminated to the IF partners, especially LDC beneficiaries, perhaps using the Focal Point Network.* [See Recommendations 18, 22.]
- 4.7.5 *It is recommended that information be provided efficiently and transparently about funds management and funding sources at the country level.* [See Recommendation 38, 78, 79.]
- 4.7.6 *It is recommended that communication skills be developed at all levels, including the IF Focal Point.* [See Recommendation 24.]

Possible Implementation Options

- Option 25: If a discrete *Communication Unit* will be created, successful implementation would require: (1) the secondment of suitable candidates who were trained or are experienced in communication, preferably with an additional background in trade and/or development; (2) under the guidance of an experienced facilitator, possibly using *Action Learning* techniques (see Annex G), guide the staff of the *Unit* in drafting the necessary organizational infrastructure, communication policies, communication management, and communication procedures, focusing on a results-based approach and drawing on best communication practices; (3) undertake a knowledge gap analysis and provide on-the-job orientation and access to specialized capacity development, as required; and (4) develop an integrated training and operations manual.
- Option 26: Using the staff of the *Communication Unit* (see Option 25), develop communication capacity in LDCs.

8. Governance

The last of the broad programmatic areas, requiring fine-tuning is *governance*. Basically the Evaluators recommend that: (1) the IFSC remain as is, as a high-level policy setting and policy review entity; (2) the IFWG become more balanced in agency, donor and LDC representation; however, from Donor comments it is evident that this may be difficult to achieve for a number of good reasons, including the need to assure full agency engagement; and (3) the IF Secretariat should be strengthened, perhaps by using secondments from the three IF partners. With respect to the IF Trust Fund, it was considered premature to offer significant recommendations, since the Fund, which was established in 2001, was only finalized with Window II operations while the evaluation was in progress. Nevertheless, the Evaluators noted, in a preliminary way, that the IFTF procedures may be a bit heavy and the speed of disbursement might be accelerated.

Grouped Recommendations

- 4.8.1 *It is recommended that the IF Steering Committee remain as a high-level policy setting and policy review entity. [See Recommendation 73.]*
- 4.8.2 *It is recommended that consideration be given to structuring the IF Working Group so as to have an equal number of representatives from each of the three IF partner groups (i.e. agencies, donors and LDCs), say two members each, and to developing a consultation network within each IF partner group to ensure adequate coverage of all partner interests. [See Recommendation 74.]*
- 4.8.3 *It is recommended that the Secretariat be strengthened through secondments from within the three IF Partners. [See Recommendation 75.]*

Possible Implementation Options

No implementation option is required with respect to the IFSC, since the IFSC would be essentially a governance body. As for the IFWG, the main concern that was voiced is the perception of imbalance of representation between the partners. There are basically two options to respond to that concern: (1) the solution implied in Grouped Recommendation 4.8.2, which would see a smaller Working Group, coupled with a consultative mechanism, and (2) a larger Working Group, consisting of six representatives from each of the three IF members. The latter option would not be easily workable, if the IFWG were to retain a great deal of hands-on responsibility. To overcome that difficulty and make the second option workable, a significant workload related to day-to-day responsibilities might have to be shifted to the IF Secretariat.

Option 27: In accordance with Grouped Recommendation 4.8.2, the IFWG would be reduced to two representatives from each member, coupled with a consultation mechanism to ensure full coverage.

Option 28: As an alternative solution to Option 27, to address the problem of perceived inequitable representation, the IFWG might be expanded to six representatives per member, while responsibilities for day-to-day matters would be significantly shifted to the IF Secretariat. This growth in both the IFWG and the Secretariat might be readily defensible: (1) if, due to the shift, the function of the IFWG would essentially be one of executive oversight, for which fewer meetings would likely be required; and (2) if due to the expected increase in the number of LDCs, as well as the potential transfer of certain functions from the IFWG, the workload of the Secretariat increases.

Option 29: The existing IF Secretariat may be asked to *estimate staffing needs* to satisfy current requirements, new requirements stemming from the expansion of the IF to other countries, requirements due to the potential shift of IFWG functions to the Secretariat, new requirements, if a Communication Unit is established, as well as other new functions that may be assigned to it, such as the oversight of the RBM process, if that should be adopted, as well as the consolidation of associated RBM-based monitoring activities.

Option 30: In the context of Option 29, recruit staff for the IF Secretariat through time-limited secondments from among the IF members, with the possibility of reappointment, so as to assure partial renewal from year to year, as required, with a view to preserving sufficient continuity over time.

A NEW IF WORLD?

Suppose that some of the major suggested changes will be made. What would the new IF-world look like? The *Terms of Reference* for the evaluation included the suggestion of potential enhanced procedures for applying IF to selected countries. The Evaluators have identified a set of necessary assumptions and a three-step planning approach.

Assumptions

The assumptions are that: (1) Country selection will be based on objective and transparent criteria; (2) countries may select themselves as candidates for IF, or IF officials may suggest that a given LDC consider participation in IF; (3) countries which will be selected will be encouraged to become fully involved from the start and that they adopt a Results-Based Management approach that is appropriate for them; and (4) fully or partially qualified local consultants will be used.

A Three-Step Planning Approach

The three-step planning approach comprises: (1) an Orientation and Assessment Mission; (2) a Planning Workshop; and (3) the formation of a National Steering Committee.

Orientation and Assessment Mission

The first of a three-step planning approach would be an *Orientation and Assessment Mission*, i.e. a process similar to the existing pre-DTIS activities. In particular, such a process would include: (1) A presentation to LDC stakeholders of IF objectives; (2) the determination of the extent of desired LDC participation; (3) the readiness for using a Results-Based Management approach; and (4) the preference for using local consultants, to the extent possible.

Planning Workshop

If the initial *Orientation and Assessment Mission* is successful, a broadly based *Planning Workshop* would be held, comprising representatives of: (1) Government; (2) the private sector; (3) academia; and (4) civil society.

The sole *purpose* of the Planning Workshop would be: (1) to discuss the potential introduction of IF into the country; and (2) broadly defining the expected long-term, medium-term and short-term results which the LDC stakeholders hope to achieve.

National Steering Committee

If the Planning Workshop indicates broad support and interest, the formation of a *National Steering Committee* would be encouraged, which would be charged, as a first priority, with drafting the design of a *Logical Framework* for IF, which as a minimum, would include: (1) expected short-term results, i.e. outputs; (2) the choice of either a full DTIS or “DTIS-Lite”; (3) the design of corresponding Terms of Reference; (4) the design of an interface mechanism between the emerging IF and existing PRSP, or National Development Plans, or similar poverty-reducing initiatives; (5) the identification of required human resources, differentiated by essential skill competencies; (6) the assessment of local availability of competent personnel; (7) participation in the negotiation between the LDC government and the competent IF authority of an IF agreement; (8) the selection of local and international consultants, as required; and (9) Results-Based Monitoring, based on the *Logical Framework*.

POTENTIAL SYSTEM ENHANCEMENTS

If this describes the new IF World that is desired, then the following IF system enhancements should be considered: (1) Clarification of IF objectives and scope; (2) objective and transparent country selection; (3) Results-Based Management; (4) a stream-lined process for introducing IF to new LDCs; (5) competency-based capacity development at all levels; (6) greater participation of local consultants; (7) greater pro-poor focus and integration in DTIS and action plans; (8) more effective integration of agency and donor processes; and (9) equitable governance representation among all three partners.

If these enhancements are undertaken, the following priorities are suggested and time requirements are assumed, subject to further refinements by eventual service deliverers.

Priorities

In suggesting priorities, the Evaluators assumed that the admission of new LDCs and a decision on the use of the IF for reducing supply-side constraints rank very highly, followed by the need to be able to monitor progress in current IF operations. In addition, certain concerns follow logically after others. With these considerations in mind, the Evaluators recommend the following ranking of priorities, where "1" is the highest:

1. Country selection (Programmatic Area 2)
2. Scope of the IF (Programmatic Area 1)
3. IF Governance (Programmatic Area 8)
4. Planning, Management, Monitoring and Evaluation (Programmatic Area 5)
5. Communication (Programmatic Area 7)
6. LDC Participation and Ownership (Programmatic Area 3)
7. Capacity Development (Programmatic Area 6)
8. Consultant Selection (Programmatic Area 4)

Time Requirements

Possible Implementation Options	Time Requirement	
	System	LDC
Supply-side constraints	To be determined (TBD) by IFSC	
Supply-side constraints		
Country selection: Macro filter	Annually, 3-5 days	
Country selection: Meso filter	Per new LDC, 3-5 days	
Country selection: Micro filter		TBD per new LDC
LDC participation: responsive	Ongoing	
LDC participation: learning environment. Training of <i>Action Learning</i> Facilitator		Ongoing 2-3 days per course*
LDC participation: IF Facilitator Tool Kit	About one month	
Consultant selection: DACUM profile development	Three weeks*	
Consultant selection: DACUM profile, recruitment		TBD LDC
Planning ... : RBM workshop, central	1 day*	
Planning ... : RBM workshop, LDCs	TBD by IF Secretariat*	
Planning ... : RBM facilitators, LDCs		TBD LDC
Planning ... : RBM facilitators, Action Learning		Ongoing ¹¹
Planning ... : RBM facilitators, performance indicators		Ongoing
Planning ... : RBM facilitators, monitoring		Ongoing
Planning ... : Agency/donor reps as mentors		Ongoing
Planning ... : Focal Point commissions secondary research		Occasional TBD
Capacity Development: DACUM workshops	3 weeks for each of three competency areas*	
Capacity Development: Orientation programme	TBD by parties*	
Capacity Development: Orientation training		Occasional *
Capacity Development: Exporter Development programme	TBD by parties*	
Capacity Development: Catalogue of courses	TBD by parties*	
Capacity Development: Learning on-the-job		Ongoing*
Communication: Establishment of Communication Unit	About 2 months*	
Communication: Communication capacity development in LDCs		TBD by IFS
IFWG Adjustment: Smaller	TBD by IFWG	
IFWG Adjustment: Larger		
Secretariat [IFS]: Estimate of staffing needs	TBD by IFS	
Secretariat [IFS]: Staffing through secondments	TBD by IFS	

*Plus preparation and travel time, the latter applying, if an international consultant is used. The need for travel time can be reduced if several workshops in one location are planned in sequence.

¹¹ See Option 7 for Action Learning Facilitator training estimate.

TABLE 1: IF EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK LINKED TO THE FINAL REPORT

Statement of Work, TOR		Evaluation Findings and Recommendations	References in Report
Objective 1			
•	The impact of the Integrated Framework in <i>linking trade, development and poverty reduction</i>	Findings: While increased trade should lead to <i>economic growth</i> , this may not automatically lead to poverty reduction. This objective may be achieved through complementary <i>pro-poor targeting and planning</i> .	3.4.2 Annex D
•	and in <i>mainstreaming trade into PRSPs and/or development plans</i> (restated in TOR)	This objective may be achieved through LDC-led, and agency/donor mentored, design of <i>Logical Frameworks</i> early in the planning process to ensure effective linkage between IF and PRSP processes.	3.4.2 Annex A
•	and its effectiveness as a <i>model for Trade-Related capacity building</i> . (restated in TOR)	This objective may be achieved through the creation of <i>competency profiles</i> , which would serve as the basis for the design of <i>modular skill and knowledge transfer</i> , using various training delivery mechanisms.	3.4.1 Annex G
Objective 2 The Impact of the Integrated Framework as a means of generating coordinated <i>donor support</i> and sufficient <i>funding</i> to a government-owned trade capacity building programme.		Findings: In light of the current programming, funding level and disbursements, the existing mechanisms appear to generate sufficient funds. More funds will likely be needed when new LDCs are selected or existing capacity-building programmes are enhanced. This objective may be achieved in a <i>Results-Based Management [RBM]</i> environment.	3.2.8.5 3.2.8.2 3.3.4
Objective 3 Reviewing the <i>roles and responsibilities</i> of agencies, donors and the LDCs, with a view to further clarifying the extent to which they have implemented these roles and responsibilities under the re-vamped Integrated Framework.		Findings: The implementation of roles and responsibilities is variable. This objective may be achieved by creating an RBM environment for planning, managing and monitoring, by fully funding the Focal Points, by creating competency profiles and corresponding capacity development, by strengthening the interface between agency and donor processes.	3.2.8
Objective 4 Addressing the urgent challenge of a systematic and predictable <i>implementation and follow-up process</i> in the post-DTIS stages.		This objective may be achieved by creating an <i>RBM</i> approach, by training LDCs, agency and donor representatives in its use, and by assigning responsibility for monitoring to LDC managers.	3.4.2 Annex F
Objective 5			
•	Effectiveness of the IF as a mechanism to deliver trade-related <i>technical assistance</i> ,	This objective can be achieved more effectively by creating and using <i>competency profiles</i> to develop capacity and by harmonizing IF/JITAP.	3.4.1 Annex G

Statement of Work, TOR	Evaluation Findings and Recommendations	References in Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and exploring its potential as an instrument for addressing the <i>supply-side constraints</i> of the LDCs. 	Findings. Since the removal of supply-side constraints require large investments and are politically more visible, these might displace traditional IF support. An IFSC guideline on IF scope is required. Other programmes may be more appropriate. Priorities need to be weighed.	3.3.6
<p>Objective 6</p> <p>Recommendation on all aspects of these TORS.</p>	Recommendations are presented by section (section numbered and sequentially numbered), as well as in grouped format	Grouped in Section 4; section numbered throughout.
Scope of the Work		
Status of implementation of recommendations in the first IF Review	Many recommendations were adopted and changes implemented. A number of issues reappear in this evaluation	3.2.1
Status of the old IF 5 Round Table Countries	The status is described in five discrete country reports	3.2.2
The process of country selection in re-vamped IF		3.2.10.1
The procedures for applying the IF to selected countries	The LDCs are not sufficiently participating in pre-DTIS activities; this should be improved, particularly if RBM is adopted.	3.2.10.2
Procedures and process for preparing the diagnostic trade integration studies	The format is variable, often lengthy and not specifically targeted to IF requirements. There are difficulties translating the Action Plan Matrices into inputs to PRSPs or into funding request packages	3.2.1.3
Quality of the DTIS	The DTIS are improving, but should become more pro-poor. The associated Action Plan Matrices should be prioritized and costed for donor action	3.2.1.2 3.4.3 (A)
Selection of consultants	More local consultants should be selected, coupled with capacity development to overcome deficiencies and mentoring by international consultants	3.2.10.4
The involvement of core agencies	There is a perception that the agencies, notably The World Bank, not only lead the process but “own” it.	3.2.1.2 (A.1)
The involvement of LDCs’ beneficiaries	While the DTIS process is expected to be country-owned, LDC involvement needs to be strengthened, particularly, at the level of the private sector and civil society	3.2.1.2 (A.1)
The involvement of donors	Donor involvement at the field level is variable, but could be stronger.	3.2.8.2
Defined roles of agencies, donors, LDCs	About half of agencies and one third of donors reported a change in roles since IF revamp, while two thirds of LDCs reported no change	3.2.8
Stable and predictable mechanisms for the follow-up of the recommendations in the DTIS	Findings: Stable and predictable mechanisms were not identified. To develop such, an RBM approach is recommended.	3.4.3
Linkages of the IF to existing development architecture: e.g. PRSPs, CCGs, and Donor RTs.	All LDCs are prepared to develop linkages. Problems relate (1) to the timing of the PRSP cycle in relation to DTIS completion and (2) to the integration of budgeted DTIS recommendations into PRSPs.	3.2.9

Statement of Work, TOR	Evaluation Findings and Recommendations	References in Report
IF potential in addressing supply-side capacity building	Supply-side concerns are ever present, but there are no clear parameters to establish outer limits within IF. Priorities need to be considered.	3.3.6
Performance criteria/benchmarks for on-going evaluation	No common performance criteria, benchmarks or related indicators were observed. Monitoring criteria and benchmarks can best be developed within an RBM process, containing universal core measures as well as LDC-specific measures. Evaluations should draw both on RBM data and secondary research Data.	3.4.4 3.4.2 Annex D Annex F
Implementation		
The development of an action plan that results from the DTIS and national workshops	The Action Plan Matrices tend not to be prioritized and costed for presentation to donors in funding request packages. To be improved.	3.2.1.2 3.4.3 (A)
Roles of Facilitating Donor, LDC recipients, and agencies in implementing the results of the DTIS	LDCs should take greater lead; agencies and donor/facilitators should mentor and coach.	3.2.8 3.2.10.4
Linkages of the process and results of the DTIS into development plans such as PRSPs and CGs/RTs	Problems relate (1) to the timing of the PRSP cycle in relation to DTIS completion and (2) to the integration of budgeted DTIS recommendations into PRSPs.	3.2.9
Re-focusing of core agency programmes for trade-related technical assistance for the specific implementation of the results of the DTISs, in programmes for regional and country operations of the six core agencies and bilateral donors	Various recommendations have been offered relating to roles, governance, procedures and capacity building.	3.3.2 3.2.8.1 (roles) 3.2.8.2 (roles) 3.2.8.4 (governance) 3.2.10.2 (procedures) 3.3.1 (capacity building)
Partner country workshops and commitment, such as through the establishment of an institutional structure for implementation, including for activities and follow-up: national implementation arrangements	Stronger orientation and assessment of LDC commitment in the pre-DTIS stages is desirable.	3.2.10.2
Involvement and association of the main regional development banks in the implementation and follow-up to the results of the DTIS; and , the involvement of other specialized relevant agencies in implementation and follow-up to the results of the DTIS	No significant involvement of regional Development Banks (IDB, African Development Bank and Asian Development Bank) was noted. [Note: The African Development Bank will likely be able to play a strong role when its planned reorganization to up to about 25 sub-regional offices is completed].	3.2.2.2 (Haiti) 3.2.2.1 (Bangladesh) 3.2.4.3 (Mali)

Statement of Work, TOR	Evaluation Findings and Recommendations	References in Report
<i>Governance</i>		
The adequacy of the IF management structure, currently incorporating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overall governance (IFSC); 	It is recommended that the IFSC remain as a high-level policy setting and policy review entity.	3.3.3 3.2.8.4 (E. 1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • day-to-day management (IFWG) 	An imbalance of membership between agencies, donors and LDCs was noted. Options for achieving balance, without reducing effective coverage should be explored.	3.3.3 3.2.8.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fund management (UNDP) 	The Trust Fund serves an essential purpose and displays effective operation. The need for two “windows” needs to be considered. The Fund may need to be publicized more widely.	3.2.8.5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trade mainstreaming (World Bank) 	The World Bank leads the mainstreaming activity. Greater LDC ownership would be desirable.	3.2.5.2 3.2.8.1E
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IF Secretariat (WTO) 	The IF Secretariat seems to be overloaded. An independent secretariat staffed with IF member secondments would be desirable.	3.3.3 3.2.8.4
<i>Funding</i>		
IF funding, modalities, and replenishment cycles	Considerable variation was noted among donors with respect to programming and funding cycles. These cycles may make it difficult to respond to emergencies, which might result in priority IF projects not receiving timely funding.	3.3.4 3.2.8.5
<i>IF and JITAP</i> and other trade capacity building initiatives. Relationship of the IF and JITAP and other trade capacity building initiatives for human and institutional capacity building	The operation of JITAP and IF should be harmonized in countries where both offer their services.	3.2.2.3 (Uganda) 3.2.4.2 (A.3.6) (Malawi)
<i>Strengthening the Role of Participating Agencies</i>		
The role of participating agencies should be examined, particularly with a view to greater involvement of all Agencies that are in the core Group. Explore the association with other UN Agencies, as appropriate	The collaboration of the six agencies in IF is exemplary, and wider participation would be desirable ¹² . Nevertheless, the agency and donor roles should focus more on coaching and mentoring, while LDCs assume a greater directing role.	3.2.1.2 (C) 3.2.8

¹² While not discussed in the Report, the involvement of the ILO, as an example, in competency-based capacity development might be desirable. That might be delivered through the ILO Training Centre in Turin, Italy, if so agreed with the Centre.