IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
APEC'S WTO CAPACITY-BUILDING PROGRAMMES

Rethinking APEC's capacity-building efforts

APEC WTO Capacity Building Group
APEC Committee on Trade and Investment

December 2006

APEC Project CTI 24/2005T "Development for the Review of APEC's WTO Capacity Building Project"

By Masahiro Igarashi
Chief, Evaluation and Planning Unit
United Nations Conference on
Trade and Development

Acknowledgements

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation examines the effectiveness of the capacity-building activities undertaken by the WTO Capacity Building Group (WTOCBG) from various angles. The evaluation establishes that many of the WTOCBG projects have had some positive impacts on the policymaking abilities of participants. At the same time, it finds that the potential of the activities has not been fully realized.

This underperformance can be ascribed to a number of factors, including operational problems associated with the *modus operandi* of WTOBCG projects. For example, project overseers may find themselves responsible for both the operational aspects of the projects and for providing effective learning opportunities, despite a lack of pedagogical or programming expertise. In addition, the design and formats of the projects may have proved less than ideal. The evaluation has found that the one-off, short-duration seminar format employed by many APEC projects is not suitable for capacity-building, although it may be effective in building awareness. Finally, there is evidence of a lack of proper attention to pedagogy, substantive preparation and follow-up. Once the activities envisaged in the programmes have been completed, not enough attention is paid to the follow-up process and hence a sustainable impact is not ensured.

The evaluation makes two key recommendations that suggest a major rethink of WTO capacity-building efforts. The first key recommendation is that the WTOCBG take a long-term programmatic approach, instead of the current event-centered approach, with each programme component aiming to achieve very concrete objectives with a specific target group.

Several other recommendations are made which relate closely to this proposal. They include an improved targeting of the beneficiaries of each activity and a more effective participant selection process; the articulation of more concrete expected achievements for each programme component; and the establishment of a clear syllabus for each course.

In addition, several recommendations relate to enhancing the effectiveness of the projects, such as using distance-training methodology; increasing the interactivity of the seminars and training events; and proactively promoting networking among participants.

The second key recommendation implies a re-conceptualisation of APEC's capacity-building as the building of a network, through which participants can gain knowledge and expert support when and where these are needed, to exploit APEC's institutional setup and its comparative advantage as a network of policy experts in the governments of member economies.

Again, several recommendations are closely associated with this suggestion, and deal with the construction or consolidation of centers of excellence as 'deposits' of expertise for the network, as well as with the details of how such a network could be managed.

Finally, a few recommendations are made regarding operational aspects and evaluation. They include a more rational sharing of roles between the partners involved in the projects and a process of evaluation that asks more pertinent questions and uses more effective methodology to assess the true performance of activities.

CONTENTS

I. Introduction

This evaluation was conducted in accordance with the decision made by the WTO Capacity-Building Group (WTOCBG) of APEC at its ninth session in May 2005 at Jeju, Republic of Korea, in the context of the project: "Development for the Review of APEC's WTO Capacity Building Project" (CTI 24/2005T).

The project document (2005/SOM2/WCBG/009-1) defined the purpose of this project as evaluating past WTO-related capacity-building activities funded by APEC's Trade and Investment Liberalization and Facilitation (TILF) Fund. The evaluation aimed at more effective future WTO capacity-building activities and the identification of evaluation methods to enable APEC economies, especially developing economies, to improve their own capacity to conduct project evaluations.

## 1.	The evaluation process and the methodology

The evaluation followed the plan described in documents 2005/SOM2/WCBG/009-2 and 2005/SOM2/WCBG/009-2a, and was conducted in four phases as follows. The first two phases were pre-evaluation phases.

First, the evaluation framework was developed by this evaluator in consultation with the project overseer of this evaluation, who is the WTOCBG member government official responsible for this evaluation. This framework is presented in Annex I of this report. The purpose was to establish a complete evaluative framework, since no such framework for APEC capacity-building had previously existed.

In the second phase, the evaluator conducted *pre-hearings* to advise developing economies on the purpose and methods of evaluation. This aimed not only to provide practical advice about this evaluation, but also to expose government officials from participating economies to evaluation methodologies in general, in order to improve their capacity to conduct evaluations independently in future.

The third phase consisted of each participating economy conducting a *first-stage* evaluation. A government official responsible for the evaluation in each participating economy was asked to follow the common methodology described in the evaluation framework developed in the first phase. This entailed, firstly, administering four sets of questionnaires addressed, respectively, to:

   (a)	the participants of the capacity-building activity being evaluated;

(b) the supervisors of the participants – to explore their motivation in sending their staff member to participate in the activity, and whether the activity had any impact on the staff member's performance;

(c) the resource persons involved in the activity, such as trainers, speakers and experts; and

(d) the project overseer of the activity (the government official from the economy that proposed the capacity-building project and who bore the principal responsibility for executing the project).

Based on the results of questionnaires and documentary analysis, the responsible official was asked to prepare a national evaluation report, following an annotated outline provided in the evaluation framework. Two national reports from the first-stage evaluations are presented in Annex II.

The final phase was the *second-stage* evaluation, conducted by this evaluator. Its aim was to provide an overall assessment and make some recommendations based on the first-stage outcomes and additional interviews in the participating economies. This report consists primarily of the outcome of this second-stage evaluation.

2. Coverage

The projects covered by this evaluation are primarily those funded by the APEC TILF Fund and implemented in the years 2002 and 2003. In addition, the Government of Canada participated in this evaluation, but used the case of a capacity-building project funded by itself and not by the TILF Fund and implemented in 2005. The projects covered are listed in Table 1 below.

While this evaluation is based on the examination of how individual projects were implemented and what results they achieved, its purpose was never to assess each individual project on its performance. Rather, the aim was to learn from these projects in order to assess the operation of WTOCBG activities as a whole and to make recommendations for future improvements.

3. Constraints

The evaluation has faced some constraints. The most problematic has been the paucity of information about the projects and their achievements. Project documents were not always systematically archived in the secretariat, and were therefore not always readily available to the evaluator. Several project reports were either not submitted or not kept on file. Other important project information, such as the list of participants and the programme of events, was only made available by a few projects. In several projects, the government officials responsible for or knowledgeable about them had moved to other jobs and were not

Table 1. Projects covered

Overseeing economy	*Project*	*Dates*
Malaysia/Japan	APEC/SCSC Training Programmes on Standards and Conformity Assessment (CTI 24/2001 T)	12-24/01/2002 28-31/11/2002
Peru	APEC/WTO Capacity Building: WTO Overview of Negotiations Agreements (CTI 26/2001 T)	12-14/6/2002
China	APEC/WTO Capacity Building: SPS Implementation Program (CTI 09/2002 T)	23-24/09/2002 12-13/12/2002
Japan	Facilitation of Developing Economies′ Participation in OECD Workshop in Cooperation with APEC — "Development Dimension of Singapore Issues" (CTI 32/2002 T)	19-20/06/2002
China/Japan	Forum on Trade and Investment (CTI 10/2003 T)	12-15/08/2003
Thailand/Japan	APEC Seminar on WTO New Issues (Trade and Investment) (CTI 12/2003 T)	20/05/2003
Australia	Confidence-Building Workshop on Trade and Environment (CTI 31/2003 T)	19/05/2003
Canada	Workshop on Best Practices in Trade Facilitation Capacity Building (CTI 22/2005 T)	22-23/05/2005

available for interview. In these cases, even the files containing the project information could not be located.

The difficulties faced by the first-stage evaluators within national governments in conducting proper evaluations posed another, related, problem. Only three projects obtained more than a few replies to the questionnaires, which prevented meaningful assessment. The analysis in this evaluation, therefore, has had to rely heavily on the interviews conducted during the second-stage evaluation. The first-stage outcomes were used primarily to check the claims made at the interviews. While the statistical significance of the first-stage outcomes is therefore questionable and potentially anecdotal at best, these outcomes do still provide some support for the second-stage findings.

4. Remarks on the assessment

In the following analysis, the first-stage evaluation outcomes of those three projects (four events) at which more than a few questionnaire responses were obtained are used to provide quantitative support for the claims made. All of the quotations in the boxes are also from these first-stage replies (some quotations have been paraphrased for the sake of

clarity). In Tables 6 - 13, these projects are labeled A, B, C and D (C and D consisting of two events within the same project). Project A had the broadest topic, while events C and D dealt with the most technical issues. These two events had the same overseer and hence only one set of replies to the questionnaire addressed to the overseers was provided.

One final remark should be made. This evaluation report may initially appear rather negative about APEC's capacity-building activities. However, the role of the evaluation is to undertake constructive criticism in order to improve future activities, and the evaluator does not intend excessive negative criticism.

II. Assessment

A. The context

5.   Trends in WTOCBG capacity-building

During the period 2001-2004, the WTOCBG approved 24 capacity-building projects under the TILF Special Account, of which 18 had been completed by September 2004. This trend is shown in Table 2 below.

The downward trend is evident from the table. A serious concern, raised during the WTOCBG meeting in 2005, is that this reflects a decline in interest in capacity-building activities, especially on the part of developing economies.

The following analysis discusses several factors that appear to have caused this trend. Before proceeding to this analysis, however, it is useful to place the capacity-building organized by the WTOCBG in the context of capacity-building undertaken globally during the same period of 2001-2004.

Table 2. Trends in capacity-building by the WTOCBG

| Year | Total budget approved (US$) | Total | Number of projects approved of which the implementing economy/-ies: | |
			included a developing economy	was a developing economy
2001	$ 968,080	8	3	2
2002	$ 505,060	7	2	2
2003	$ 624,565	5	3	0
2004	$ 394,518	4	1	1

Source: Progress Report on WTO Projects 2001-2004 (2004/SOMIII/WCBG/003)

6.   The global context

Some officials interviewed alluded to the fact that the capacity-building provided by the WTOCBG makes up only a small part of the range of capacity-building activities undertaken in developing economies. These include not only the assistance provided by bilateral donors and multilateral agencies but also training provided internally — by

Table 3. Trends in global capacity-building assistance on "trade policy and regulations"

Year	Amount committed (US$ thousands)			Number of projects		
	Total	*Bilateral*	*Multilateral*	*Total*	*Bilateral*	*Multilateral*
2001	$ 650'026	$ 299'608	$ 350'419	2'362	962	1'400
2002	$ 656'989	$ 274'629	$ 382'360	4'540	1'685	2'855
2003	$ 934'302	$ 407'673	$ 526'628	5'358	1'567	3'791
2004	$ 812'054	$ 325'798	$ 486'256	5'275	1'480	3'795

Source: WTO-OECD Trade Capacity Building Database

countries' own governments — in various forms. It was suggested that developing economies may find it easier to rely on other sources of assistance if it proves difficult for them to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the WTOCBG. In short, there is a competitive market for suppliers of capacity-building.

Table 3 illustrates global trends in the capacity-building activities provided by all bilateral donors and multilateral agencies during the period 2001-2004 under the WTO-OECD category of "trade policy and regulations" to which WTOCBG capacity-building belongs.

Although the data in Tables 2 and 3 are not strictly comparable, together they provide some indication of WTOCBG capacity-building in relation to global capacity-building activities. In 2004, WTOCBG capacity-building activities only accounted for roughly 0.05 to 0.1 per cent of global assistance. In addition, while WTOCBG activities exhibited a downward trend between 2001 and 2004, this pattern is reversed on the global scale.

7. The needs of beneficiaries

However, the small size of the projects and the existence of competition do not mean that the assistance provided by the WTOCBG is irrelevant. This evaluation has found that the projects have resulted in some positive impacts, and that the beneficiaries of the projects have used what they have learned in their work (see the section on impacts in the assessment below). The upward global trend illustrated in Table 3 also indicates that there is a growing demand for capacity-building. The quotations in Box 1 reveal the outcomes desired by both participants in the sessions and their supervisors and demonstrate that the downward trend in WTOCBG capacity-building is probably not due to a lack of demand. Rather, as was reiterated in the interviews, the trend has developed because the opportunities presented by

---

Box 1 Desired outcomes of WTO capacity-building activities

— *Responses from participants in WTOCBG capacity-building activities*

"Since WTO issues are constantly developing, both basic training and training on new issues are important for the job. The more topics and information we are familiar with, the better proposals we can draft. We believe the training courses will benefit individuals and facilitate the process of WTO negotiation."

"It is important to be familiar with the themes of the WTO negotiations. These sessions have provided important information for bilateral and multilateral negotiations."

— *Responses from the supervisors of the participants*

"APEC's capacity-building activities should be involved more efficiently in supporting stan-dardization and conformity assessment activities of developing countries."

"We consider it important to deepen understanding [of WTO issues] and to continue to assist the business and production sectors to better understand the subject of commercial integra-tion, in view of [the Bogor objectives] of supporting the integration of free commerce in the Asia-Pacific region".

---

the WTOCBG have not been attractive enough to developing economies, which have therefore neither proposed many projects nor actively engaged with the projects that have taken place.

B. The *modus operandi*

8.   The *modus operandi* of WTOCBG projects

The *modus operandi* of WTOCBG projects is based on the assumption that the economy which proposed a project will implement it in its entirety.   Within the economy, the organizational unit which expressed the need for a project will normally be responsible for its implementation — i.e. it becomes the *project overseer*. This method of project design is intended to ensure maximum ownership by the beneficiary economies, and should enable these economies to operate the project in ways that respond fully to their needs. It is also intended to make the projects demand-driven, since they are proposed by those who will provide the labour input and who will benefit most from them.

Unfortunately, this *modus operandi* has not worked in the way intended. Rather, it has become the source of many problems. Those who express the need for a project often lack

the capacity to operate the project both in terms of substance and of logistics. The unit responsible is often not equipped with the skills required for implementing capacity-building projects, and work on the project is normally supplementary to their regular duties. This has meant that, under the pressure to deliver, priority is given to logistical and organizational aspects, and not enough attention is paid to other aspects such as the substance or methodology of the training. The main concern becomes whether there will be enough participants rather than whether the training will achieve its objectives. One project overseer from a developing economy lamented that he could not pay attention to the seminar itself because of the organizational tasks and problems involved. In addition, once the event is over, the responsible

> **Box 2. Organizing activities**
>
> — *Response from a capacity-building activity project overseer*
>
> *"Organizers have to coordinate and direct all aspects of the event. However, it is a burden … since there are a lot of aspects that have to be coordinated with different offices within and outside [the ministry]. Unless both APEC and WTO offices [of the government] are really committed with regard to both the logistical and substantive aspects, in the end the more committed party ends up with most of the work."*

unit is often not motivated to provide proper reporting or follow-up to the event, since it is often not engaged with APEC affairs in its regular duties.

Some developed economies have offered to co-sponsor projects in order to alleviate the capacity constraints faced by developing economies (see Table 1). However, these have been rather *ad hoc* arrangements, with no clearly defined role-sharing and, on occasion, high coordination costs. Ultimately, these arrangements, while effective in ensuring delivery, have not ensured ownership by developing partners or a demand-driven nature for the projects.

9.   Delays

Several project overseers from developing economies raised the issue of the delay between the inception of a project and its actual implementation. For example, one project submitted to the WTOCBG for approval in May 2002, with a target date of implementation in May-June 2003, was not actually implemented until November 2004. Furthermore, in this case the preparatory process prior to submission to the WTOCBG was very lengthy and iterative. In effect, more than three years passed from the time the project was suggested to its implementation. This delay created a situation in which the project overseer, who conceived and proposed the project, was moved to another post and a replacement officer had to take over the project. Having not conceived the project herself, the replacement officer had to prioritise delivery rather than quality. In other cases, delays have meant that projects have had to change topic or shift focus in the middle of preparations because of changed circumstances, such as progress made in the WTO negotiations.

The interviewees attributed these delays to several factors: (a) projects are often prepared and implemented by those whose skills do not include the organization of capacity-building activities; (b) the operation of projects is often supplementary to organisers' regular duties; (c) as a general rule, each project has to be prepared from scratch; (d) the administrative and procedural requirements may be rather too onerous for the type of projects proposed; (e) the APEC Secretariat cannot offer much support to facilitate preparation; and (f) the WTOCBG project-approval process inevitably leads to a delay of at least a year. The issue of delays clearly relates to the *modus operandi* of WTOCBG projects, as well as to the one-off nature of most of the events, as discussed below.

C. Project design

10. Short one-off seminars

Most of the WTOCBG capacity-building projects were conceived as small-scale one-off seminars (see Table 4). Although this is perhaps the simplest form of capacity-building activity, it places rather a heavy burden on project overseers since each project has to be built from scratch, while at the same time the small scale of the projects does not justify their full-time engagement.

However, not many questions seem to have been raised during the project design or approval process about whether or not this was the form of capacity-

> **Box 3. Training formats**
>
> *- Response from a speaker at a capacity-building activity*
>
> *"Having a concentrated learning period for up to a week with a small team of trainees is much more effective than a fly-in/fly-out workshop format, where the workshop attendees often have different levels of understanding and experience, are often numerous, and there is little change for careful explanation in response to questions."*

Table 4. Nature of the projects

Project	Nature of the project	Duration
CTI 24/2001T	Basic to intermediate training on technical issues	4 days
CTI 26/2001T	Seminar with broad participation to build awareness	2 days
CTI 09/2002T	Seminar on specific technical issues	2 days
CTI 32/2002 T	Symposium/seminar to build awareness and to share ideas	2 days
CTI 10/2003T	Symposium/seminar to share ideas	3 days
CTI 12/2003 T	Symposium/seminar to share ideas	2 days
CTI 31/2003T	Seminar to deepen understanding	2 days
CTI 22/2005 T	Seminar/workshop to share ideas and best practices	2 days

Source: APEC project documents

building activity most suited to achieving the stated objectives. Indeed, a quick analysis of project documents provides no evidence of a decision-making process behind the choice of this format.

Since, in many cases, projects have to be started from scratch, there has been little accumulation of either tangible or intangible resources — such as networks of experts, pedagogical materials or organizational know-how — or the establishment of economies of scale to enable maximum use of the small budgets. Nor does APEC, unlike some other international organizations, have a secretariat with enough resources to support the overseers in terms of technical or organizational aspects. Because of these factors, short one-off seminars incur higher *indirect* or *hidden* costs, for example in the form of the time spent on preparation, than other forms of capacity-building. These seminars are therefore not as inexpensive and cost-efficient as they may appear from the budget figures.

The format of one-off seminars has caused problems above and beyond these inefficiencies. Since one-off seminars do not have a history of past achievements or registered participants, some overseers fear that they will not attract enough interest. They have therefore tended to be excessively lenient about the selection of participants, or to set an agenda too broad to be particularly useful.

The short seminar format also provides limited learning opportunities. There is only so much that can be absorbed during two or three days of presentations. A substantial proportion of time is spent on lectures and presentations, often provided in succession by experts, which could have been replaced by reading materials or distance training. Gathering a number of government officials in one place on a set date can be costly, especially in terms of the opportunity cost of their time. These opportunities, however, do not seem to have been used to their fullest. There is little evidence of planning with regard to what could most usefully be achieved both during the event and before or after it.

11.   Target beneficiaries and immediate objectives.

<div style="background:pink;">

Box 4. Successful project design

— *Response from a capacity-building project overseer*

"Project selection and preparation criteria should include increased emphasis on sustainability of results of project and integrated projects with a narrower scope and objectives."

</div>

For the project to attain maximum effectiveness, it must have clearly defined *target beneficiaries* and concrete *immediate objectives* with a sufficiently narrow scope appropriate for the targeted beneficiaries. Based on these elements, the best delivery method can be identified. This must be done at the stage of

Table 5. Purpose of the projects

Project	Target beneficiaries	Immediate objectives
CTI 24/2001T	Experts in the knowledge of certain technical issues (TBT Agreement etc.)	To train beneficiaries to participate effectively in standard setting and in discussions at related WTO committees
CTI 26/2001T	The public and private sectors and academics	To provide a general overview of the commitments and benefits of being a WTO member
CTI 09/2002T	Officers with specific responsibilities (quarantine and related administration)	To train beneficiaries on management and technology for SPS implementation, and to study and discuss possible problems and solutions
CTI 32/2002 T	Developing economy delegates	To develop knowledge of the WTO Singapore issues
CTI 10/2003T	Not specific (APEC economies)	To increase understanding between different stakeholders
CTI 12/2003 T		
CTI 31/2003T	Senior officials directly involved in the WTO negotiations on trade and environment	To deepen understanding, to facilitate open discussion and to identify common priorities

Source: APEC project documents

project conceptualization.

For this evaluation, the available project documents were examined to see whether and how each project has provided such elements. The results varied from one project to another, as shown in Table 5. In general, it was found that the more technical the issue, the more specific the target and objectives. Nevertheless, it is obvious that there is still considerable room for improvement.

D. Preparatory process

12. Selection of participants

To achieve the best results from a capacity-building event, a proper selection of participants is critical. No event can be designed to provide maximum learning opportunities for both novices and experts.

> **Box 5. The needs of participants**
>
> — *Response from a speaker at a capacity-building seminar*
>
> *"A general presentation of the disciplines in the [WTO agreement] and other regional trade agreements would have been sufficient, given the background of the participants. Instead, the presenters were also asked to deal with sectoral issues... I did not see any demand for that kind of presentation."*

II. Assessment

An analysis was conducted to see what types and levels of participants were expected by the project overseers and whether such participants had actually been selected. Table 6 indicates that, while the overseers in every project expected experts or experienced people to attend, in fact the backgrounds of the participants were diverse. Moreover, the supervisors of the participants — those who decided to send them to the activity — seem to have selected less experienced staff members in the subject matter than intended by the project overseer who designed the activity.

Table 6 also demonstrates that the expectations of participants were mixed for every project. Whether such expectations were met is shown in Table 7. These two sets of responses together reveal that the participants' expectations were diverse, and that levels of experience in the area of concern also differed. This contrasts with the general perception by the overseers that the projects largely met the expectations of the participants.

Table 7 also shows that there was a mixture of participants in terms of the reason they chose to attend the programmes. Some were directly responsible for the specific issues

Table 6. Purpose of participation

Questions and answers					
	Projects	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*
Purpose of participation (participants' responses)					
Primarily to become familiarized with the issue.			1	1	2
Primarily to expand and deepen knowledge.		5	3	3	2
Being familiar with the issue, to gain a better overall understanding.		1	2	1	1
Being very familiar with the issue, to learn about new developments.			1		
Purpose of participation (supervisors' responses)					
Primarily to become familiarized with the issue.		1		1	1
Primarily to expand and deepen knowledge.				1	1
Being familiar with the issue, to gain a better overall understanding.		1			
None of the above; it was the participant's turn to attend a training.					1
Objective of the project (overseers' responses)					
Primarily for those who were not familiar with the issue					
Primarily for those with some experience to expand their knowledge or understanding.		1		1	
Primarily for experts to explore new issues and gain new perspectives.			1		
Primarily for multi-stakeholder dialogue to deepen mutual understanding of interests and constraints.					

Source: First-stage evaluations

taken up by the project, while others were responsible for WTO-related issues or for APEC matters. These results again demonstrate diversity among participants. Where such diversity exists, it is difficult to conceive of a project that would serve the best interests of all.

Throughout the interviews, it was pointed out that the selection of participants was one of the most difficult issues. Interestingly, there was a divergence between the views of the overseers from developed and those from developing economies. Project overseers and organizers from developed economies generally considered that a reasonable effort had been

Table 7. Selection of participants

Questions and answers	*Number of replies*			
Projects	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*
How did the programme compare with the purpose of participation? (participants' responses)				
Just about right.		2	3	1
Better than expected.	2	3		1
Could have had more in-depth analysis, discussion or interaction, even if it meant less coverage or less information.	2	2	1	1
Could have had more information or broader coverage; perhaps it was too short.	3	1	1	
The contents differed somewhat from what was needed or expected.				
Were participants selected according to the objective? (overseers' responses)				
Just right.	1		1	
A mixture.		1		
Reason for attendance (participants' responses)				
Being the expert on this topic.	2	2		2
Dealing with WTO issues.	3	3	1	1
Dealing with APEC issues.	2	3	2	
It was the participant's turn to attend a training.			1	
Actions taken to ensure the right selection of participants (overseers' responses)				
Clear indication of the issue to be discussed in the invitation/announcements.	1	1		1
Clear indication of who should participate/benefit from the program in the invitation/announcements.				1
Participants were selected based on the applications received.		1		1
None (it was left for the sending governments to decide).				1

Source: First-stage evaluations

Table 8. Preparation of participants

Questions and answers		Number of replies			
	Projects	A	B	C	D
Preparation of the participants (overseers' responses)					
The agenda and a description of the purpose were provided.		1			
Only the agenda was provided ahead of time; other materials were provided on arrival.			1		
Reading materials received prior to the event (participants' responses)					
No materials received.		2	4		
Just about the right volume, contents and format.			2	3	2
Too much, could have been more selective.					
The coverage of the subject was not sufficient.		4			1
Too much material; could have been made easier to read.			1		
Not enough time was allowed to read the materials.			1		1

Source: First-stage evaluations

made to ensure that the selection of participants was more or less appropriate. They pointed out that the contents of programmes and the levels of experience and knowledge required were indicated clearly enough in the invitations and the agenda of the events. However, the interviews of officials from some developing economies revealed that the selection of participants was often affected by factors other than appropriateness. Reasons for selection unrelated to appropriateness included: it was the participant's 'turn' to benefit from the event, or even from the travel and the break from the work; it was the participant him or herself who had the decision-making power and hence could take advantage of the opportunity; or it was an event organized by a friend.

13. Selection of presenters/instructors

This is another area in which some project overseers faced problems, particularly those from developing economies who did not have a sufficient pool of experts from which to select. In some cases, project overseers had to go through a lengthy and repetitive process of searching for an expert. They said that such a considerable amount of time had been spent on securing an expert that not much time was left for the substantive preparation of the events.

Table 9. Preparation of presenters / instructors

Questions and answers	*Number of replies*			
Projects	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*
Preparation of presenters/instructors (overseers' responses)				
Briefed on the topic to cover.		1	1	
Briefed on their role in the event as a whole.	1	1	1	
Briefed on the levels of knowledge and types of participants in order to target their presentation.		1		
Asked to participate in the substantive preparation of the whole session.				
A coordination meeting was held for the speakers.				
Preparation of presenters/instructors (presenters'/instructors' responses)				
Only the topic to speak on was provided.	1			
Explained the purpose of the whole programme, and the role to play in it.	1			
Interaction with other presenters/instructors to coordinate the contents.				
Materials beyond presentation materials (presenters'/instructors' responses)				
Asked to prepare reading materials for participants.	1			
Asked to prepare reference materials to be used in the work after the session.				
The session was for experts; no need for any extra materials.				
No particular request to prepare any materials other than the presentation materials.	1			
Targeting for the audience (presenters'/instructors' responses)				
Contents were prepared with the target audience in mind.				
Contents were what I could prepare in the given timeframe, regardless of the audience.	1			
Participants' levels of knowledge were mixed; hence I could not target the audience.	1			

Source: First-stage evaluations

14.   Substantive preparation

A good project, whether a seminar or a training session, requires proper substantive preparation. If this is left largely to resource persons, such as speakers or hired trainers, they must be guided on what they should teach participants and, if there is more than one of

speaker or trainer, their sessions should be coordinated to ensure consistency and adequate coverage. They should also target the audience, since a general lecture is not useful to anyone. Participants could also be prepared beforehand so that they arrive with a minimum level of knowledge and can learn more efficiently.

In general, as shown in Tables 8 and 9, there was little evidence of any substantive preparation of the events beyond informing presenters of the broad issues to be covered and distributing some presentation materials or papers to participants. The degree of such preparation varied from one project to another, and from one speaker to another. The general conclusion must be that there is considerable room for improvement in this area. The substantive preparation of these events must become much more systematic.

Table 10. Performance at the event

Questions and answers	*Projects*	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*
General assessment of the event (overseers' responses)					
The event went as well as intended; all the participants gained knowledge.				1	
There could have been more discussion and interaction.		1	1		
The time was too short to cover all the topics.					
Some presenters could have prepared better.					
At times, some participants may have been unable to follow the teaching.					
There was a good exchange of views and participants learned from each other.			1	1	
Knowledge gained by participants (speakers'/instructors' responses)					
A great majority of participants absorbed knowledge and gained understanding.		1			
The results were mixed; some participants did well, others did not seem to have fully understood the contents.		1			
A significant number of participants seemed to have had difficulties understanding the contents.					
Assessment of the presenters/instructors (participants' responses)					
All of them were excellent, and were the right people to cover the topic.		6	3		3
Some of them could have done better in terms of performance or preparation.			5	4	1
Some of them may not have been the right choice for the topic covered.			1		

Source: First-stage evaluations

E. Effectiveness and performance

15. Performance at the event

Now that the design and the preparatory process have been examined, it remains to be seen whether the events were successful. Table 10 shows responses from participants relating to event performance. Broadly speaking, it can be concluded that the events went reasonably well. There is some divergence in the views of participants, which probably reflects the divergence in their expectations as noted earlier.

Two points need to be made regarding these responses. A non-negligible number of participants considered that the performance of presenters varied. This may relate to the manner in which the presenters were selected and prepared — or not prepared. Secondly, some participants considered that the sessions could have involved more discussion and interaction. This point was underscored by many in the interviews and will be discussed separately below.

16. Interactivity of the sessions

Table 11. Interactivity

Questions and answers		*Number of replies*			
	Projects	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*
Interactivity (participants' responses)					
I frequently asked questions or expressed opinions.		4	1		1
I occasionally asked questions or expressed opinions.		1	2		2
The subjects of the training were mostly new to me and it was difficult to ask questions or express opinions.		1	1	3	1
The subjects of the training were not really of interest to me and therefore I did not ask questions or express opinions.				1	
The session was organized to be interactive.			1		
The session was not really interactive and/or had no time to be interactive.			3		
Interactivity (speakers' responses)					
Many participants actively participated to the discussion.		1			
Participants mostly remained silent.		1			

Source: First-stage evaluations

Many interviewees, as well as some respondents to the questionnaires distributed at the end of events, expressed the wish for more interactive sessions (see also Table 11.) Indeed, it is widely agreed that the learning experience is significantly enhanced by an appropriate number of interactive sessions and sufficient hands-on practice to confirm and digest what the participants have learned.

However, since most of the APEC projects were short one-off seminars, the organizers seem to have hesitated to introduce more interactive sessions because it is difficult to predict and control how such sessions will develop and whether participants will engage sufficiently in the sessions. There is a legitimate fear that such sessions could be a waste of precious time.

Nevertheless, there are ways to introduce sufficient interactivity to the sessions even in short events. The key is better planning and preparation to reduce the unpredictability of the sessions. Unpredictability will decrease if the session is organized in such a way that the participants are guided through exercises and discussions. The issues to be discussed need to be focused in order to provoke meaningful exchanges. Hands-on practice sessions with prepared exercises could also be used for some topics. Another way of enhancing the

---

Box 6. Actions taken by participants after capacity-building training

— Responses of participants in capacity-building training activities

"I participated in the elaboration of national proposals on the subjects related to the Committee of Agriculture ..."

"Our office is involved in the issue of import permits... I have re-evaluated the purpose of requiring import permits... reduced processing times... reduced documentary requirements ..; proposed an electronic filing system for applications for and issue of permits... used the materials given during the workshop for reference ..."

"I have worked closely with colleagues who handle trade facilitation issues in the WTO."
"I have drafted the first National Export Strategy."

"I have been closely engaged with the WTO negotiations on trade in services."

"I became involved in the standards development process of our Bureau ... and was thus able to put into practice the concepts learned ..."

"I have been engaged in several local meetings on WTO issues such as TBT, SPS, Trade Facilitation, NAMA, FTA..."

"I have been actively engaged in handling national WTO/TBT notification authority/enquiry point activities and also in supporting the ISO/IEC national committee secretariat..."

participatory approach is to ask participants to make brief presentations in a small group session. The unpredictability will remain, however, if a block of time is simply reserved for discussion and it is left for presenters and participants to engage in the discussion.

F. Impact and sustainability

17. Impact

The outcomes of the first-stage evaluations at the national level indicate that some participants have used what they have learned in the events in their work, or assumed responsibility for areas covered at the events. The evidence is rather anecdotal and the extent to which this occurred varies from one project to another. Nevertheless, these outcomes suggest that, generally speaking, the topics chosen for the projects were relevant.

Table 12. Usefulness and impact of the event

Questions and answers	*Number of replies*			
Projects	*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*
Usefulness for job performance (participants' responses)				
What was learned was directly relevant to and useful in my job.	4	2		1
I was moved to a post, or newly assigned a responsibility related to the topics covered.			2	1
What was learned was somewhat useful; it occasionally helped me in certain tasks.	1	3	1	2
The broader understanding of the issue has been useful, rather than specific knowledge or skills.		3	1	
Actions taken after the event on issues covered (participants' responses)				
I have participated in WTO negotiations.			1	
I have made interventions or actively engaged in WTO negotiations.			1	
I have drafted proposals or position papers in WTO negotiations.	3	1		
I have provided technical support to WTO negotiators.	1	2	1	
I have developed policy proposals to implement WTO agreements or other trade liberalization measures.	1	1		
I have developed proposals to facilitate the implementation of WTO agreements or other trade liberalization measures.	1	1		1
Other.	2	1	2	1

Source: First-stage evaluations

II. Assessment

Since the topics chosen for the projects were largely relevant, some participants will always benefit in one way or another. However, it is not clear to what extent this happened, individually or collectively.

The issue is the lack of systematic follow-up with the participants to ascertain whether the project had a positive impact on their work, and if so, to enquire how this was achieved.

Table 13. Follow-up and knowledge management

Questions and answers	Projects	A	B	C	D
			Number of replies		
Feedback provided to colleagues (participants' responses)					
A formal briefing/feedback session.		1	1	1	1
Explanation of how to use the materials from the event.				1	
Reporting to supervisor.			4	4	
Advice or help provided when needed.		1	4	1	3
No formal feedback provided.		3	1	1	2
Feedback provided to colleagues (supervisors' responses)					
Reporting to supervisor.				1	2
Proactive sharing of knowledge.		2		2	
Advice or help provided when needed.				1	1
Use of materials after the event (participants' responses)					
The materials were used to retrieve information or recall concepts.		5	6	3	4
The materials were not used.			2	1	
Actions taken to ensure use of knowledge and to follow up (overseers' responses)					
The materials used during the event were then provided to participants and/or posted on a website.		1	1		1
A contact list of participants and experts was provided.			1		1
Participants were informed of contacts for further assistance on specific issues.					1
Follow-up activities were undertaken with individual participants.					
Dissemination of project outputs (overseers' responses)					
The outputs were not made suitable for dissemination.					1
The outputs were made suitable for wider dissemination.			1		

Source: First-stage evaluations

Without such follow-up, it is difficult to identify ways to ensure the usefulness of contents and the effectiveness of the learning process for all participants. With a few exceptions, once the project is over, there is little motivation for the project overseers to engage in proper analysis and then to follow up on the events.

18.   Sustainability: follow-up processes and knowledge management

One of the key elements of ensuring the impacts of these capacity-building events is to enhance the sustainability of these impacts. Since the opportunities provided by short seminars are limited, both in terms of frequency and of numbers of participants, it is important that the knowledge and understanding gained at the events are shared with others at the institutional level and used in the long term.

Two aspects are key to the sustainability of the follow-up process. One is *knowledge management*: ensuring that the use of knowledge accumulated during the event is not confined to the event itself. Another is *network management*: participants must be able to obtain support when and where it is needed. There are many ways of ensuring proper knowledge and network management; the most suitable method depends on the format of the activity itself. This evaluation looks first at the knowledge management possible, given the short seminar format of the activities concerned. Network management will be discussed separately in section 19.

Table 13 indicates the actions taken by the participants and the project overseers following the events. Fewer than half of the participants organized formal feedback sessions or proactively shared knowledge with their colleagues. On the other hand, the materials prepared for the session were used later by the participants in order to retrieve information or recall concepts. However, not much information was provided by the project overseers beyond that made available during the event, nor was much follow-up undertaken. Materials and knowledge gathered for the event were not often put into a format that would be easy to use by participants or others later on.

A general feeling was expressed in the interviews that, in many cases, the project overseers had to focus so much on the delivery — i.e. on successful organisation — that they were simply too exhausted to undertake many follow-up activities. Furthermore, when the overseers were not otherwise involved in APEC matters or long-term multi-phased programmes, there was little motivation for them to either follow up or to make resources available for knowledge management. A similar situation is described by the participants: once the event was over, there was little incentive to build further capacity without any follow-up or sustained network activity.

In terms of the management of materials provided, it was also noted that merely posting them on a website is not very useful. As we are living in an age of information saturation, it is important to organize knowledge so that a particular piece of information is easily located

and immediately useful.

19. Sustainability: networking and network management

Network management is extremely important in making project impacts sustainable and in building capacity since participants are able, through the network, to use the knowledge and expertise accumulated by the projects. 'Networking' is a deliberate action taken in the context of the projects to establish such networks.

Professional networking with experts and between participants is considered, formally or informally, to be one of the major objectives of most projects. Some cases were reported in the first-stage evaluations of participants subsequently contacting presenters when they needed to introduce a policy measure similar to the national experience presented at the training, or when they visited a presenter's home city. The former cases suggest that presentations of national experience and concrete case studies encourage participants to benefit from networking more than do lectures of a general nature. These cases were rather *ad hoc*, however, and a more systematic approach would have benefited all of the projects and participants.

In terms of networking at the events, the records and interviews suggest that not many actions were taken beyond organising social occasions such as receptions and luncheons. Networking did not occur naturally on these occasions to any extent that might be considered successful. In a couple of events observed, participants tended to cluster along national lines. One reason suggested was cultural; participants will not interact spontaneously or sufficiently without a more explicit context.

In many projects, it was stated that a list of participants was distributed at the event. However, with a few exceptions, the lists were not made available to the evaluator and some project overseers had difficulties in locating them. The lists were not readily available from the secretariat, nor were they updated, and no attempt was made to maintain the network by communicating regularly with the participants after the event.

As mentioned above, uniting government officials from many APEC economies engaged in similar professional functions in one place is a costly affair. It is also a golden opportunity to develop professional networking. This opportunity, however, does not seem to have been utilized sufficiently.

<div style="background-color:#f5dfe6; padding:1em;">

Box 8. Follow-up actions

- Responses from participants in capacity-building events

"I have, on a few occasions, got in touch with a colleague who also attended this workshop and discussed how we have carried out trade facilitation measures in our respective agencies. It also so happened that one of the presenters is from the Philippine Customs and we have, from time to time, bumped into each other at various formal and informal gatherings and I take these opportunities to ask him for updates regarding their efforts..."

"I am regularly in contact and collaborate with Ministry of Commerce officials in the process of drafting the National Export Strategy."

"No, I did not receive any contact list for the participants or experts."

— Responses from speakers at capacity-building events

"Since the event, from time to time I have had visitors in Washington who attended the event, or who I met during my stay. I have also answered some emails from people who attended."

"Several participants contacted me by email in the weeks following the training. They were interested in how they, their organizations or their countries could participate in drafting various international standards that were mentioned during the training session.... Other enquiries were more specific, relating to what standards were the most appropriate in specific circumstances, and how certain standards could be used in a regulatory context ... and how best to reference standards in bilateral and regional MRA development for free-trade purposes."

</div>

G. Evaluation

20.   Evaluation

This evaluation also examines how individual projects have been evaluated in the past. Generally speaking, within APEC, the term 'evaluation' seems to mean self-assessments conducted by the project overseers, rather than external evaluations like this one. Some member-government officials indicated that self-assessments are preferred to external evaluations because self-assessments strengthen the accountability of the project overseers and encourage their own learning. In reality, however, the project overseers tend to see the self-assessment as a reporting requirement or an obligation, rather than as a learning opportunity. The assessment method was limited to conducting surveys of participants at the end of events and compiling the results in the project report, if any report was produced. There was little trace in these reports of analysis that could lead to strategic improvements.

The APEC Secretariat also compiles and publishes the lessons learnt from the self-

assessments in the project reports. However, these lessons do not (or cannot) go much beyond what was contained in the original self-assessments, and there is no evidence that these lessons have actually been used in subsequent project designs.

Notwithstanding the abovementioned shortcomings in the methodology and the use of evaluation results, some analytical conclusions can be drawn from these self-assessment outcomes.

The most common questions asked in the participant surveys conducted at the end of events were their views on: (a) whether or not they learned from the event, and if so what (the effectiveness question); (b) whether they thought that the event was useful, and whether they would use what they had learned in their future work (the impact question); and (c) how the event could have been improved (the lessons-learnt question). While the raw responses were only available for a few projects, they do provide some pointers.

To the question about what they had learned, the participants gave varying answers, often citing very specific facts they picked up during the event. This demonstrates that at least some knowledge was transmitted by these projects. On the other hand, the great variety of answers may indicate a lack of structural preparation of the projects in terms of what, precisely, participants were expected to learn from each event.

To the question about whether the event was useful, participants generally replied in the affirmative. However, this being a subjective question posed at the end of the event, it is doubtful that they could have answered otherwise. As one interviewee pointed out, participants need to justify their participation, and government officials would therefore find it difficult to answer this question in the negative. A systematic follow-up, which asks this question after a certain period, could provide a better picture.

With regard to the question about how the event could have been improved, some interesting ideas were submitted by participants, including: making it more interactive, using case studies, going into more technical depth, making each presentation more focused, and creating websites and opportunities for future interaction. The key question is whether these ideas were fed into the design of future projects and whether they led to particular follow-up activities. The interviews and the examination of project documents do not yield much evidence that either of these objectives were achieved in a systematic manner.

III. Recommendations

In this chapter, a number of recommendations are made based on the analysis and assessment made in the previous chapter with a view to improving the current capacity-building programmes of the WTOCBG.

Two key recommendations suggest a major rethink of the way that capacity-building is conceived and operated in APEC today. One is to depart from the current tendency to equate capacity-building with organizing seminars, and to take a more deliberate and longer-term programmatic approach (recommendation 1). Recommendations 2 to 9 are closely associated with this recommendation, but can be implemented separately. The second key recommendation is to consider capacity-building in APEC as the construction of a network in which knowledge is accumulated and through which expertise is utilized (recommendation 10). Again, recommendations 11 and 12 are closely associated with recommendation 10 and can be implemented separately. A third important recommendation is to reconsider role sharing among the various parties involved in APEC's capacity-building projects (recommendation 13). Finally, two recommendations are made in relation to evaluation (recommendations 14 and 15).

Recommendation 1. Programmatic approach

Consider a programmatic approach, rather than the current event-centered approach, with each programme component aiming to achieve very concrete objectives with a specific target group.

The above analysis has exposed the limitations and associated problems of the current event-centred approach. Building real capacity will require a more deliberate and longer-term approach. It should be emphasised that short seminars do have their uses: for example, they are particularly effective in building awareness of certain important issues. However, this should not be confused with building real capacity to establish and implement policies.

The programmatic approach here refers to building a programme composed of multiple components, each of which has a clear and focused objective. In an approach akin to the *logical framework* with its hierarchy of objectives, individual programme components with lower-level *immediate objectives* should be organically linked so that, together, they lead to the higher-level *ultimate objective* of capacity-building.

For example, a programme could be composed of basic training courses, including distance-training courses, to familiarize participants with important concepts; workshops to build skills for using these concepts through hands-on exercises; workshops for experienced

policy practitioners to discuss national case studies; roundtables of experts to explore new issues; and *ad hoc* post-event assistance to participants when and where they need it to help them to establish or implement policies.

Recommendation 2. Targeting beneficiaries and expected achievements

Ensure that a programme component or an event is well targeted in terms of the level of knowledge and expertise of the beneficiaries and what it is expected that they achieve.

As seen in the above sections, WTOCBG projects have sometimes been too generic and addressed to too broad an audience to be very useful for the daily work of any particular group or individual. It is important to ensure that this does not continue to be the case for any of the projects.

Whether or not the programmatic approach explained above is used, each programme component or project should have clear target beneficiaries and concrete objectives. This targeting should include not only the job functions of participants but also their levels of knowledge, expertise and experience of a particular issue.

It is essential to think in terms of the following: whose capacity the activity aims to build; what is expected of participants at the end of the activity; and what is the best method of achieving these aims. If it is difficult to imagine that all the participants can achieve the same objective, then the beneficiaries have not been sufficiently targeted. This approach requires thinking from the demand-side — i.e. the needs of target beneficiaries - rather than from the supply-side — "we should teach this to whoever is dealing with it because it is an important issue".

It should be noted that it is possible to organize an event with different levels of participants and with multiple purposes. However, this type of event should be deliberately structured through, for example, parallel or staggered sessions to allow each group of participants to achieve its own objectives.

Recommendation 3. Prototypes

Create prototypes of programme components as building blocks of a project for those project overseers who may be experts or practitioners of the issue in question but not of capacity-building methodologies or pedagogy.

One of the potential difficulties facing project overseers is that they may know the subject matter and the needs of potential participants but are not necessarily experts in constructing capacity-building programmes from the methodological and pedagogical angle. Creating prototypes of programme components or projects for them to use in building

project proposals would be very helpful. This could be done with assistance from pedagogical experts.

Recommendation 4. Selection of participants

Explicitly agree at the intergovernmental level that there will be a selection process for participation in APEC capacity-building activities, and that invitations to participate should not be taken as open-ended.

The importance of selecting the right level of participants has been emphasized above. The current usual method of selection involves the project overseer sending an invitation and the receiving governments selecting participants. Given the intergovernmental nature of APEC projects, the project overseer may hesitate to question the selection by the governments. It may therefore be helpful to establish an explicit agreement that there will be a strict selection process and that the expression of a desire to participate may not guarantee acceptance.

Recommendation 5. Syllabus

Establish a clear syllabus for each project component, defining in very concrete terms what participants are expected to learn. Ensure that instructors or presenters follow this syllabus. Establish in concrete terms what participants should know before participating in each event or course.

To provide effective learning opportunities, there should be a clear and detailed syllabus for each event or project component. Bullet points could also be prepared on what participants should have learned before participating in an event or a course, and what they are expected to learn from the event or the course.

This will help participants to equip themselves with the minimum knowledge required to benefit from the event or the course. It will assist resource persons or trainers in organizing the activity with minimal duplication and with the most effective role-sharing. It will also enable project overseers to assess the effectiveness of learning and to adjust programmes if necessary.

Recommendation 6. Distance learning

Use distance-learning techniques, involving both online courses and self-study kits.

Given the geographical range that APEC activities need to cover and the limited number of events the WTOCBG is able to provide, the merit of using distance-learning techniques is unquestionable. The potential difficulty of motivating participants to follow the distance training could be overcome by providing incentives and recognition to those who complete

the course, for example by issuing certificates and/or invitations to subsequent project activities, as recommended below.

Distance training, if successfully implemented, is an economical means of reaching a wider audience. However, distance training alone cannot build capacity; it should therefore be conceived as one part of the basic training within a programme or project.

Recommendation 7. Interactive sessions

Make seminars and training courses much more interactive, using case studies, moderated discussions and simulation exercises whenever possible.

The benefits of making project events more interactive are widely recognized. The opportunity of having participants and resource persons together in one place should be used to the full. Such opportunities can be used not only to increase basic knowledge, but to confirm learning, clarify complex issues, exchange opinions and practice the skills learned, particularly if they are combined with pre-sessional training.

Recommendation 8. Networking

Facilitate networking and interaction between the participants more proactively, for example through hands-on workshops and through follow-up activities.

As emphasised in the above analysis, networking is one of the most important objectives of capacity-building activities and, as discussed below, it is an area that APEC in particular should exploit to the utmost.

Effective ways of facilitating networking include group exercises with a mixture of participants from different economies and follow-up activities to keep the network active. Possible follow-up activities will be discussed below in the recommendation on network management. Taking the long-term programmatic approach with registered participants also helps them to feel affiliated to the network.

Recommendation 9. Incentives and certificates

Consider issuing certificates for the satisfactory completion of courses as an incentive to engage seriously in the programmes. Consider linking invitations to future events with the satisfactory completion of training courses.

One of the issues raised during the interviews was the potential difficulty of engaging government officials in project activities, particularly distance training and follow-up activities. Many of them find it difficult to set time aside from their daily work for capacity-building activities. Providing certificates, not of participation but of completion of

programme stages, could be a good way to motivate them to continue working on programme requirements. Taking the programmatic approach would make it easier to establish credible certificates. Another way to encourage self-study is to link the proper completion of study to invitations to future workshops and seminars.

Recommendation 10.   Capacity-building through a network

Consider capacity-building in APEC as the construction of a network which links government officials, who will be the users of expertise gained through the network, with 'centres of excellence' where such expertise will be accumulated and disseminated.

APEC is primarily a forum of governments — or, more precisely, many fora of government officials who are responsible for policymaking and policy implementation in particular areas. It does not have a central secretariat to provide knowledge and expertise as some international organizations do. Capacity-building in APEC must therefore take a form that is suitable for APEC's structure.

Capacity-building in APEC could be conceived as the construction of a network through which participants could obtain knowledge and expert advice when and where they are needed, and explore new issues with colleagues in different economies who face similar challenges.

In order for this to happen, knowledge and expertise should first be accumulated in some parts of the network which could be referred to as *centres of excellence*. Participants could obtain necessary knowledge and expert advice through/from these centres of excellence, and the centres could manage the substance and networks of capacity-building programmes. The role of the WTOCBG and other similar bodies of government representatives would then be to ensure that these centres of excellence were responding to the real needs of member economies and providing quality services. Government officials who participate in the capacity-building programmes would be the users of the knowledge and expertise gained through the network.

APEC already has networks of specialists in different forms and its member economies have established various types of institutions engaged in policy-related research. These existing networks and institutions could be used to build centres of excellence on issues of concern to the WTOCBG and other fora.

If such centres of excellence were created in developing economies, they could also provide technical and substantive support for policymaking in these countries. This would be another major achievement in building real capacity in policymaking and implementation in developing economies.

Recommendation 11.   Network management and services

Treat the participants of capacity-building programmes as those who are registered for a longer-term programme and a part of the professional network, rather than one-time participants of an event. Provide network services, such as expert advice on demand, to registered participants.

Capacity will ultimately be built on the abilities of those government officials who have participated in capacity-building projects or programmes to use the knowledge and expertise they have accumulated through the network. The network of these officials, with different levels of skills and responsibilities, should therefore be maintained and used to supply updated information and provide access to knowledge and expertise.

Providing readily available and regularly updated contact information to and about both participants and experts is a minimum requirement. If the programmatic approach is taken, individual participants should be registered on the programme and their progress through the various programme stages should be managed, including through the awarding of certificates.

The network should not be the only method used to supply information to participants. A service could be provided in the form of *ad hoc* expert advice from the centres of excellence to participants on request. This would respond to the real needs of policymaking and policy implementation. Training in the use of such network resources should form part of capacity-building activities.

Recommendation 12.   External resources

Explore and use external resources much more extensively and wisely, whether they are distance-learning courses, centres of excellence or expert networks.

APEC already has networks and resources that could be used in a much more systematic manner for its capacity-building programmes. These resources should be integrated into the programmes from the design stage. Given the limited budget that can be allocated to its capacity-building projects, APEC could outsource certain project or programme components, or use existing external pedagogical materials. In the context of network building, knowledge management and course design could be outsourced to designated centres of excellence.

Recommendation 13.   Role sharing

Explore better ways of sharing roles between government offices (both substantive departments or agencies and the offices responsible for APEC matters), the APEC secretariat, and those external partners who can provide expertise on subject matter, pedagogy or logistical organization (e.g. research institutes, international organizations, private service companies).

The roles involved in capacity-building activities include:

- the *overseer*, who has overall responsibility for the project or programme;
- the *project manager,* who manages the daily tasks related to a project or a programme component, assigns tasks and monitors progress, and is the focal point of communication for that particular project or programme component;
- the *programme/network manger* (for long-term programmes), who oversees the overall progression of programmes and the implementation of individual programme components, and who manages network activities as well as the registered participants and their progression;
- the *substantive content manager,* who is responsible for the programme content from the substantive viewpoint and for effective learning from the pedagogical viewpoint;
- *resource centres or persons,* who provide the substantive content of particular project or programme components, and could be the focal points for knowledge management and the providers of expert services to the network in a longer-term programme; and finally,
- the *logistical organizer* of a project or a programme component.

Several roles can be undertaken by a single person or entity but there must be a clearer understanding of these roles. How the roles are shared depends on the objectives and the substance of the projects, or the availability of suitable persons or institutions, and may vary from one project to another. This evaluation has made it clear that some rethinking must be done, as a result of which a common understanding of new role-sharing procedures or new guidelines on the *modus operandi* could be developed.

Recommendation 14.   Project evaluation

When evaluating individual projects and programme components, use questions on the substantive content for measuring effectiveness (i.e. the extent of learning) and a follow-up questionnaire for measuring impact (i.e. the extent of usefulness).

Any evaluation must ask three main questions. The first is the effectiveness question: whether the participants have learned from the activity. The second is the impact question: whether they have used what they learned (or used the learning opportunities provided by the network). The third is the lessons-learnt question: how the activity could have been

improved.

With regard to the first question, the most objective method of evaluation is to ask concrete questions about what the participants were expected to learn, rather than asking whether or not they have learned anything. This is equivalent to the method used in other educational environments, such as schools, where students are tested on the contents of their course to verify how much they have learned. Such an evaluation method would require the establishment of a syllabus, or list of points that the participants are expected to learn.

In terms of the second question, the usefulness of a project or programme component cannot really be measured at the end of an event or course, but should rather be evaluated after a certain period — say, four to six months. This allows participants opportunities to actually use the knowledge or skills they have acquired through the project activities and therefore to provide as reasonably objective a measurement of the project's impact as possible. The use of such a follow-up questionnaire would obviously be more effective in a longer-term programme with an established network of participants and experts.

Finally, establishing clearer and more concrete objectives for the project or the programme component will help evaluators to ask more focused questions.

Recommendation 15.   Follow-up evaluation

Consider undertaking another in-depth evaluation, several years after the recommendations are put into effect, to examine the new operation of WTOCBG capacity-building projects.

Regardless of how many of the specific recommendations contained in this report are actually adopted or implemented by the WTOCBG, it is assumed that some changes will be made to address the questions raised by this report. Although this report has made recommendations for a new system, there is no guarantee that this new system will work without a hitch — it is natural to expect any system to have operational problems. It would therefore be useful to look again at any new operation after several years. An in-depth evaluation of this sort would, like this one, look at the effectiveness and mechanics of the new system, rather than assessing individual projects or programme components.

IV.   Conclusion

This evaluation report has examined the effectiveness of the WTOCBG capacity-building efforts from various angles. It has found that many projects seem to have had some positive impacts on the policymaking abilities of participants, to the extent possible within the confines of the format adopted. It has also found that the potential of the projects was not fully realized due in part to operational difficulties; the basic design of the projects and their format; and the lack of proper attention to the pedagogy and substantive preparation of events and to the follow-up to the process.

This report has therefore made several recommendations. The two key recommendations suggest a major rethink of WTOCBG capacity-building or, more broadly, capacity-building in the context of APEC. The first recommends that the WTOCBG take a long-term programmatic approach rather than the current event-centred approach. The second suggests a re-conceptualisation of APEC's capacity-building in terms of the construction of a network through which participants can gain knowledge and expert support when and where they are needed.

Even if the WTOCBG decides to follow these recommendations, or some of them, their implementation may not be straightforward. One possibility is to implement them in stages and/or to choose some subject areas for which to start building a long-term programme that will lead to a capacity-building network. If these long-term programmes are successful, the experience can be replicated for other subject areas. It is hoped that such an effort will bear fruit and that this evaluation has made some contribution, however small, to the goals set by the member economies of APEC.

<u>Annexes</u>

Annex I

Evaluation Framework

**prepared for
APEC project CTI 24/2005T
"Development for the Review of
APEC's WTO Capacity Building"**

by

**Masahiro Igarashi
1 August 2005**

* * *

1. Scope of evaluation

This evaluation is conducted in two stages, as provided in 2005/SOM2/WCBG/009-2 and 2005/ SOM Ⅱ/WCBG/009-2a. The first stage is composed of economy-level evaluations covering the following projects.

At the second stage, results of the first-stage evaluations will be summarized, an assessment will be made on the basis of these results and recommendations will be put forward with a view to improving the design and operations of future projects of the WTO Capacity-Building Group (WTOCBG). Given that this is the first such evaluation of the series of WTOCBG projects, this evaluation will attempt to address broader questions than merely the effectiveness of individual projects listed above, questions that will be relevant for the capacity-building activities of the WTOCBG in general.

Overseeing economy	Project	Dates
China	APEC/WTO Capacity Building: SPS Implementation Program (CTI 09/2002 T)	23-24/09/02 12-13/12/02
China/Japan	Forum on Trade and Investment (CTI 10/2003 T)	12-15/08/03
Chinese Taipei	The Environmental Impact Analysis of Trade Liberalization Measures — Methodology and Case Studies (CTI 14/2004 T)	6-8/07/04
Malaysia/Japan	APEC/SCSC Training Programmes on Standards and Conformity Assessment (CTI 24/2001 T)	12-24/01/02 28-31/11/02
Peru	APEC/WTO Capacity Building: WTO Overview of Negotiations Agreement (CTI 26/2001 T)	12-14/6/02
Thailand/Japan	APEC Seminar on WTO New Issue (CTI 12/2003 T)	20/05/03

2. Responsibilities

The first-stage evaluations will be conducted under the responsibility of individual members of WTOCBG from the economies concerned, who will be assisted by the evaluation expert, as well as by the Friends of the Co-Chairs Group for the APEC's WTO Capacity-Building Project (FOCG), in terms of process and methodology. The first-stage evaluation will use the evaluation format appended at the end of this document, which was finalized under the responsibility of the evaluation expert and FOCG. The second-stage evaluation will be conducted by the evaluation expert. The FOCG will act as the manager of the project and will oversee the whole evaluation process, with a view to ensuring the project's contribution to the future capacity-building activities of the WTOCBG.

3. Timeframe

It is anticipated that the first-stage evaluations will be conducted during July-August 2005, with the possibility of reporting back, inter-sessionally, on the status of their progress on the occasion of the APEC SOM III meeting to be held in September 2005. The second-stage evaluation, and any supplementary research for the first-stage economy-level evaluations, will follow the above, with the target of reporting back the results with recommendations at the next scheduled WTOCBG meeting during the APEC SOM I meeting of 2006 in Viet Nam.

4. Issues to be covered

Whether a capacity-building activity was useful, or whether it achieved the expected results, cannot easily be assessed simply by asking these questions. This evaluation will hence attempt to investigate the usefulness and effectiveness of capacity-building activities from various different angles. It will focus largely on questions that can produce actionable results.

A. Identification and conceptualization of projects

One of the central issues to be addressed in this evaluation is the *relevance* of the capacity-building activities implemented under WTOCBG. It will question whether the activities are:
- *what member economies really need?*
- *what member economies should expect from APEC capacity-building?*

By asking the beneficiary economies to propose projects and take ownership in implementing them, WTOCBG intends to ensure that the projects are demand-driven. However, for a number of reasons, such as the lack of capacity to implement projects, beneficiary economies may not have been able to express their true needs. This may have been manifested in the declining number of proposals made by these economies. Hence, it is worth examining whether there is any other practical way to draw out and assess the need for capacity-building, more systematically but without overly burdening member economies.

This evaluation will therefore focus on the issue of consultations. Since the WTOCBG deals with issues relating to the WTO, it is questioned first and foremost whether WTO negotiators were consulted when assessing needs collectively or individually. Other actors involved in WTO-related issues could also be identified as possible source of ideas for project proposals. Through this analysis, the evaluation will attempt to explore how needs can be assessed regularly in future, as they will evolve in response to progress in the negotiations on the Doha Development Agenda and the imple-

mentation of the WTO agreements, as well as other trade liberalization and facilitation measures.

B. Design of the project

The *effectiveness* of a capacity-building activity hinges on designing the project with a clear purpose, identifying target beneficiaries and selecting the best format for them to achieve the defined goal. For example, an exploration of new issues or a multi-stakeholder dialogue must be designed and implemented differently from a skills training on well-known issues. Training cannot be effective for participants with a wide divergence in levels of expertise.

It may be the case that, because of limited resources on the part of project organizers, attention is paid more to the issues and to logistical or organizational aspects, rather than to how the activity should be designed and delivered. This evaluation will attempt to examine the extent to which the project is designed with a clear purpose and with the best format for target beneficiaries.

It should be noted that an event can be organized with more than one purpose and a mixture of different sets of participants. This is particularly useful since *networking* is considered to be a major, albeit often unstated, benefit of participation in capacity-building activities. A multi-purpose nature, however, should not exempt events from the need for each section to be designed with a clear purpose and target beneficiaries. The benefit of mixing different participants should also be weighed against the risk of an inefficient use of time and resources. This risk could be mitigated by a careful design of the event and a clear understanding of the purpose of each segment, for example through an optimal sequencing of the sections.

C. Preparation of the project

There are several key elements in the preparatory phase of a capacity-building activity that determine its effectiveness. The first is the selection of participants: even the best-designed activity cannot achieve its objective if the right participants are not selected. The evaluation will examine this aspect by looking into how the participants were selected and whether they had appropriate expectations of the activity.

The second element is the substantive preparation of the participants. Firstly, the learning process is greatly enhanced if the participants are properly prepared before the event with regard to its substance. Secondly, there is a limitation to the amount of knowledge participants can absorb during the event. Thirdly, even the most rigorous selection of participants cannot eliminate knowledge gaps among them. For these reasons, providing participants with the opportunity, materials and incentives to prepare themselves before the event will greatly enhance the likelihood of effective learning. The evaluation will question whether any such substantive preparation of participants took place and, if so, whether it was done with proper care, for example with regard to the volume and format of materials provided.

The proper preparation of presenters, trainers, instructors and other invited experts (hereafter, referred to as the presenters) is another element leading to a successful event. Although selecting the right presenters is extremely important, in reality there are often limitations on the choice of presenters. This problem will be eased if the presenters are properly prepared and coordinated, and involved in the substantive preparation of the event. The evaluation will try to ascertain to what extent the purpose of the activity, their role and the level of participants were explained to the presenters, and whether they were prepared accordingly.

D. Implementation of the project

One of the main questions to be asked in a project evaluation is whether the expected results have been achieved. This question relates firstly to the design and preparations of the project ex-

iii

plained above, such as whether the participants had appropriate expectations of the activity, and whether the project was implemented appropriately to fulfil these expectations. The evaluation will ask to what extent the participants' expectations were achieved, and analyze the results in conjunction with the evaluation of the design and preparation of the project.

The second aspect relates to the quality of the activity. This includes the contents, delivery and organization of each section of the event. The issue of contents includes not only the appropriateness of issues addressed but the level and volume of information provided. The issue of organization refers to the format of the event, such as lectures, discussions, exercises, simulations and so on. Assessment of these issues should ideally be done immediately after each section of the event. This evaluation will limit its inquiry to a few questions regarding the level and volume of the contents and the format of the event in general. To complement the assessment by participants, the evaluation will attempt to elicit the views of the presenters or trainers on the degree of involvement and interactivity of the participants.

E. Follow-up to the project

Since participants cannot absorb more than a limited amount of information during an event, it is important for the *sustainability* of the event's impact that materials are provided in such a way that participants can easily refer to them in future, either to recall certain concepts or to look up specific information. The evaluation will examine whether the materials provided were prepared in such a manner that facilitated their later use, and whether participants actually referred to them in their work.

One of the central issues in modern capacity-building is how to translate individual learning into institutional learning to maximize the sustainability of impacts. This is particularly important when the target beneficiaries are government officials whose responsibilities often change. The evaluation will examine whether and how participants fed back to their colleagues and others, and whether the materials provided were in a format suitable for this purpose.

Another question relating to the overall impact of WTOCBG capacity-building is that of knowledge management. Each capacity-building activity held by the WTOCBG produces a plethora of specialized knowledge on WTO-related issues. This body of knowledge should be made available for later use by member economies. The evaluation will attempt to examine whether and how this has been done, and seek views on how it could be done on a more systematic basis.

F. The impact of the project

The main objective of WTOCBG capacity-building activities is to help developing economies to implement WTO agreements and to participate fully in the WTO Doha Development Agenda negotiations, thereby promoting further progress in the negotiations. The evaluation will hence make an attempt to examine how WTOCBG capacity-building activities have contributed to this end. However, it is difficult to establish direct causality between the capacity-building activities and concrete progress made in WTO negotiations or the implementation of WTO agreements. Hence, the evaluation will focus on changes in the behavior or responsibilities of the participants, and on actions taken by them, that may have resulted from their participation in the capacity-building activities.

G. Implications for the future direction and the role of WTOCBG activities

The evaluation will address certain questions in order to provide some thoughts on the possible future direction and role of WTOCBG capacity-building activities.

Firstly, it has been observed that proposals for capacity-building activities from developing economies have not been as forthcoming as intended. This may be related to difficulties in identify-

ing needs, in conceptualizing projects, or in making commitments to implement projects when there are competing demands for limited resources within developing-economy governments. This evaluation will attempt to investigate this issue with a view to proposing an alternative *modus operandi* to alleviate this problem and to enable WTO capacity-building activities to achieve their objectives more effectively.

Secondly, the evaluation will attempt to provide some benchmarks by asking participants to compare their expectations and experience of WTOCBG events with those of capacity-building events organized by non-APEC organizations and fora. This question will also be considered a means of assessing the overall effectiveness of WTOCBG capacity-building and of providing ideas about its future role, including collaboration with other bodies engaged in similar capacity-building activities..

The analysis of these issues will provide a basis for considering the future direction of WTO capacity-building activities, to ensure the fulfilment of the main objective of helping developing economies not only to implement WTO agreements but also to build their capacity to participate fully in the WTO Doha Development Agenda negotiations.

Finally, the evaluation will make suggestions for future evaluation practices for WTO capacity-building activities. These suggestions will take into consideration the need for evolving evaluation practices and formats, as the needs for capacity-building activities change with the progress made in Doha Development Agenda negotiations and in the implementation of WTO agreements, and also as the recommendations from the evaluation are implemented.

5. Methodology

For the first-stage evaluation, those responsible in each member economy will act as the evaluator, and conduct the evaluation using the evaluation format provided in this document. The evaluation format is composed of:

I.   an annotated outline of the first-stage evaluation;
II. question lists to be used in the first-stage evaluation; and
III. a skeleton of the summary table of the question results.

The first-stage evaluator will collect information in accordance with the question lists provided in (b) above, through questionnaires and telephone/face-to-face interviews, and also from other available sources, such as project documents, project reports, announcements, communications and assessments made by those involved in the event. Based on the answers to the questions and other supplementary information, the first-stage evaluator will attempt to make a brief assessment in line with the annotated outline provided in (a) above with support from the evaluation expert and the FOCG if required. The motivation and angle of analysis to be contained in this assessment were elaborated in Section 4: Issues to be covered of this document, and the annotated outline follows the issues described therein.

For the final product of the first-stage evaluation, this brief assessment should be accompanied by a summary table prepared in accordance with the skeleton (c) above and the original materials used in the evaluation (individual question results, supporting documents, etc.)

The second-stage evaluation will be conducted by the evaluation expert, based on the first-stage evaluations and evidence collected therein, as well as any supplementary information and interviews as required. The expert will make a summative assessment and produce recommendations applicable to WTOCBG capacity-building activities in general. The FOCG will oversee the second-stage evaluation, and will establish an administrative program for the evaluation.

Evaluation Format

I. Annotated outline of the first-stage evaluation

II. Question lists
> **Question list A: Questions for participants**
> **Question list B: Questions for supervisors**
> **Question list C: Questions for presenters/instructors**
> **Question list D: Questions for project overseer(s)/organizer(s)**

III. Skeleton of the summary table of the replies to questions
> **(not included: provided separately as an EXCEL file)**

Quick help for the first-stage evaluator: "What to do"

Collect the following materials as far as possible and make a first attempt to provide some analysis, as described in **I. Annotated outline**.
> Project document and report
> Materials distributed before, during and after the event
> Programme of the event
> Announcement, letters of invitation, etc.
> Communications to the presenters, instructors, trainers, invited experts, etc.
> Assessments by participants to the event
> Any other material relevant to the project

Review **II. Question lists**. Some answers may already have been already provided by the documents above. Some questions may not be relevant for the project. In these cases, not all of the questions need to be asked.

Obtain the replies to the questions in **II. Question lists** by:
> distributing the questions by mail/e-mail, possibly followed up by telephone calls
> conducting telephone interviews
> conducting face-to-face interviews ("Coffee break?")

Put the replies into a summary table, using **III. Skeleton of the summary table**.

Complete the analysis and assessment based on **I. Annotated outline**.

Annex I. Evaluation Framework

I. Annotated outline of the first-stage evaluation

A. Background

A brief explanation could be given about the project and its stated aims, the way it was implemented, and any notable results, as an introduction to the evaluation.

B. Assessment

Needs and relevance

Analyze:
What was the motivation behind this project? How was the project based on needs, and of whom? How were these needs assessed?
Based mainly on:
- Replies to the questions D (i)(ii)
- The project document and report (any evidence that shows that the project was based on needs, or that needs were appropriately assessed)

Design

Analyze:
Was the project designed with:
    - a clear purpose,
    - the audience clearly targeted, and
    - the most appropriate format for this content and audience?
Based mainly on:
- The project document
- The programme of the event
- Replies to the questions: A (iii) (iv) (v) (vii); B (i) (iii); C (i) (iii); D (iii)

Preparation

Analyze:
Were the right participants selected? Were their responsibilities and levels of expertise appropriate? Did they match the profile that was established for this project?
Based mainly on:
- The project document
- Replies to the questions: A (i) (ii) (iii) (xi); B (i) (iii); D (iv) (v)

Analyze:
Was any action taken to prepare the participants? Was the material given to them prepared in formats that were easy to use? Were any incentives provided to participants to encourage them to prepare themselves properly?
Based mainly on:
- Materials given to the participants prior to the event
- Replies to the questions: A (vii) (viii); C (ii); D (vi)

Analyze:

Was the substantive content of the event sufficiently well prepared? Were the materials, presentations and coordination of presenters/instructors well prepared and managed?

Based mainly on:

* Materials used during the event
* Replies to the questions: A (vi); C (i) (ii) (iii) (v); D (vii)

Implementation

Analyze:

Was the project delivered in such a way as to meet participant's needs? Were the format and contents the most appropriate for the purpose?

Based mainly on:

* The project report and assessments
* The programme of the event
* Replies to the questions: A (iv) (v) (vii); C (iv) (v); D (viii)
* Firsthand information on the way project was implemented

Analyze:

What was the quality of delivery? Were any problems encountered? How did the presenters/instructors perform?

Based mainly on:

* The project report and assessments
* Replies to the questions: A (vi) (vii); C (iv) (v); D (viii)
* Firsthand information on the way project was implemented

Follow-up

Analyze:

What efforts, if any, were made to ensure that participants used the knowledge gained after the event? Were these efforts effective?

Based mainly on:

* Replies to the questions: A (ix); C (vi); D (ix)

Analyze:

What efforts, if any, were made to build not only individual capacity but also institutional capacity? Were these efforts effective?

Based mainly on:

* The project document or report (any evidence of the attempt to build institutional capacity)
* Replies to the questions: A (x); B (ii); D (ix)

Analyze:

What efforts, if any, were made to build and manage the knowledge accumulated for use by APEC economies at a later time? Were the project outputs later put to appropriate use or disseminated widely?

Based mainly on:

* The project document and report (any evidence of the attempt to build and manage knowledge), or any other information on knowledge building
* Replies to the question: A (xiii); C(vi); D(x) (xi)

Impact

<u>Analyze:</u>
Does the project appear to have caused any changes in the behaviour or responsibilities of the participants? Was the event relevant to the jobs of the participants, or have participants changed job to become responsible for the issues? Have the participants taken any action that relates to the implementation of WTO agreements, the Doha Development Agenda negotiations or other measures that promote them?
<u>Based mainly on:</u>
* Replies to the questions: A (ix) (xi) (xii); B (iii) (iv); C (v); D (xii)

Future direction and role

<u>Analyze:</u>
Was there any element that might have discouraged those from developing economies from proposing projects? Were any difficulties encountered in proposing a project, conceptualizing it or making commitments to implement it? Were any changes in the *modus operandi* suggested?
<u>Based mainly on:</u>
* Replies to the questions: D (xiii)(xiv)(xv)
* Any other information or evidence

<u>Analyze:</u>
Did the project involve the kind of activities that are most appropriate to the APEC context? Are there any similar activities conducted by others that would make these activities redundant? What would be the most fitting role of APEC in this regard and where would the demand for its activities be the highest?
<u>Based mainly on:</u>
* Replies to the questions: A (xiv); B (v); C (vii); D(xiv)
* Information on activities elsewhere

<u>Analyze:</u>
Was the evaluation of the project properly conducted and the outcomes disseminated in order to profit from the lessons learned? If not, what problems were encountered? How could the situation be improved?
<u>Based mainly on:</u>
* Replies to the questions: D (xvi) (xvii)

C. Conclusions and suggestions

Any conclusions, views, summary of findings, suggestions, etc. that are drawn from the assessment and analysis above, and from the experience of WTOCBG capacity-building activities.

II. Question lists

Note for using the question lists

In the questions in the lists, the word "*event*" could be replaced by *training session, workshop, seminar or exercise* as appropriate to the event organized by the project.

If those in charge of the first-stage evaluation know the answers to certain questions, they can provide the answers themselves (i.e. they do not always need to ask the participants, presenters, etc.). Some questions could be answered, for example, by checking the facts in a document.

The respondents to the question can choose more than one answer to each question.

It may be useful to give/show the programme of the event to the respondents to facilitate their recollection.

The "**participants**" (question list A) are those who participated primarily to learn from the project – i.e. those whose capacity the project aimed to build.

The "**supervisors**" (question list B) are generally those who decided to send the participants, and those who would benefit from the improved service of the participants. In some cases, the participants themselves are responsible for the decision to participate, and/or are responsible for the work related to the project event (i.e. the participants themselves could be considered the supervisors). In such cases, the concept of the "supervisor" may not apply, and this question list can be ignored.

The "**presenters/instructors**" (question list C) are those who participated in the event primarily to provide their knowledge or expertise, rather than receiving knowledge or expertise. Depending on the nature of the event, they could be presenters, instructors, trainers, invited experts and so on. In certain cases, they could also be considered to be participants (see question list A).

The "**project overseer(s)/organizer(s)**" (question list D) are those who proposed, designed and implemented the project, or those who were responsible for the project's implementation. In some cases, those who proposed the project and those who had overall responsibility for it may be different from those who were responsible for different stages of the project implementation (e.g. substantive preparation of the event). In these cases, they can be asked only those questions applicable to them. In such cases, however, all the questions can be answered by combining the answers from different people.

Annex I. Evaluation Framework

<u>Question list A: Questions for participants</u>

(i) Why have you (or your institution) decided to attend this event?
- Because I am the expert on this topic in my government.
- Because I deal with WTO issues.
- Because I deal with APEC issues.
- Because it was my turn to go.
- Any other reason (please describe)

(ii) Did you feel you (or your institution) had been given sufficient lead-time to decide whether to attend and who would attend?
- Yes, we had sufficient time to decide.
- Not really, we just decided on the spot.
- I don't know.

(iii) Which best describes your purpose of attending this event?
- I came primarily to familiarize myself with the issue.
- I came to expand and deepen my knowledge.
- I am familiar with the issue but wanted to gain a better overall understanding.
- I am very familiar with the issue but was interested in learning about any new developments.

(iv) In general, do you feel the event achieved the expectation you had in terms of its purpose?
- It was just about right.
- It was better than I expected in terms of achieving my purpose.
- It could have had more in-depth analysis, discussion or interaction, even if it meant less coverage or less information.
- It could have had more information or broader coverage; perhaps it was too short.
- The contents were somewhat different from what I needed or expected.

(v) In terms of different segments of the programme, how many of them were relevant for you in performing your job?
- All of the sessions and contents were of direct relevance to my job.
- Some sessions were very relevant, others were not although they were interesting.
- Most of the sessions were not really directly related to my job.

(vi) What did you think of the presenters/instructors?
- All of them were excellent, and were the right people to cover the topic.
- Some of them could have done better in terms of performance or preparation.
- Some of them may not have been the right choice for the topic they covered.

(vii) How much did you intervene during the event?
- I frequently asked questions or expressed opinions.
- I occasionally asked questions or expressed opinions.
- Not much, because the contents were mostly new to me and I found it difficult to ask questions or express opinions.
- Not much, because the contents were not really of interest to me.
- I had to express views because the session was organized to be interactive.
- I did not intervene much/at all because the session was not really interactive and/or I had no time to do so.

(viii) If you received any reading/self-study materials prior to the event, how would you assess those materials?
- I did not receive any such materials.
- The materials were just about right in terms of volume, contents and format.
- There were too many materials, they could have been more selective.
- The coverage of the subject was not sufficient.
- There were too many materials, they could have been made easier to read.
- I did not have enough time to read the materials.

(ix) After the event, what have you done with the materials provided?
- I have used the materials in performing my job to retrieve information or recall concepts.
- I have not used the materials from the event in my job.

(x) After the event, did you provide feedback to your colleagues?
- I shared my knowledge with my colleagues in a formal set-up (a briefing/feedback session).
- I explained to my colleagues how to use the materials I brought back from the event.
- I reported to my supervisor.
- On occasion, I used my knowledge gained from the event to advise/help my colleagues.
- I talked with my colleagues about my experience, but did not organize anything formal.

(xi) After the event, have you used what you learned from the event in your job in general?
- Yes, what I learned from the event was directly relevant to my job, and I use the knowledge all the time.
- I was moved to a post, or newly assigned a responsibility, related to the issues dealt with at the event.
- What I learned has occasionally helped me handle certain tasks.
- Rather than specific knowledge or skills, the broader understanding of the issues I gained has been useful.
- Marginally, because the contents were somewhat irrelevant to my job.
- Marginally, because the event was not well organized, or lacked focus.

(xii) After the event, have you taken any of the following actions on issues covered by the event?
- Participated in WTO negotiations.
- Made interventions or actively engaged in WTO negotiations.
- Drafted proposals or position papers for WTO negotiations.
- Provided technical support to WTO negotiators.
- Developed policy proposals to implement WTO agreements or other trade liberalization measures.
- Developed proposals to facilitate the implementation of WTO agreements or other trade liberalization measures (e.g. policies to minimize negative impacts or to harmonize legal systems to international standards).
- Other

If any of the above applies, could you please provide a brief and concrete explanation of the action(s) taken?

(xiii) After the event, have you contacted other participants or experts in relation to work related to the event's topic?

Have you got any suggestions as to how to facilitate networking, or make networking more useful after the event?

(xiv) **Have you received training or attended seminars/workshops organised by others, including international organizations, academia and the private sector? If yes, could you list a few that are similar to this event in nature or subject?**

How would you compare them? What are the differences in their nature and their usefulness for your job?

Question list B: Questions for supervisors

(i)   What was the main purpose of sending this person to the event?
- S/he needed to familiarize him/herself with the issues since s/he will eventually deal with them.
- S/he had some knowledge about the issues but could expand and deepen this knowledge.
- S/he was an expert on the issues, and could benefit from the discussion or new information.
- It was his/her turn to go.

(ii)   After the event, did s/he feed back?
- S/he reported to myself (or other supervisors).
- S/he shared the knowledge proactively with others.
- S/he advised or helped when needed.

(iii) After the event, was there any recognizable change in her/his behaviour or responsibilities?
- S/he has always been the expert on these issues, so it is difficult to tell.
- The issues related to the project became his/her responsibility, either as a new responsibility or more clearly than before the event.
- S/he was transferred to a post covering the issues related to the project
- Sometimes, s/he has used the knowledge/skills gained at the event.
- S/he has taken initiatives on the issues related to the event that s/he perhaps could not have taken without her/his participation in the event.
- There was no marked difference before and after the event although s/he works on related issues.
- What s/he learned does not seem to be relevant for the job s/he is assigned to.

(iv)   After the event, has the participant taken any of the following actions on issues covered by the event?
- Participated in WTO negotiations.
- Made interventions or actively engaged in WTO negotiations.
- Drafted proposals or position papers for WTO negotiations.
- Provided technical support to WTO negotiators.
- Developed policy proposals to implement WTO agreements or other trade liberalization measures.
- Developed proposals to facilitate the implementation of WTO agreements or other trade liberalization measures (e.g. policies to minimize negative impacts or to harmonize legal systems to international standards).
- Other.

If any of the above applies, could you please provide a brief and concrete explanation of the action(s) taken?

(v)   What would you expect from APEC capacity-building activities, as compared to those offered by other international organizations, bilateral donor agencies, academic institutions, etc.?

Question list C: Questions for presenters/instructors

(i) Was the purpose of the event and your role clearly provided prior to the event?
- I was just given the topic to speak.
- I was explained the purpose of the whole programme, and what role I should play in it.
- I had some interaction with other presenters/instructors to coordinate the presentation/ session.
- The main purpose, in my view, was an exchange of views or experience- or knowledge-sharing, rather than training. Hence, there was not much point in coordination prior to the session.

(ii) Were you asked to prepare, or help prepare, any materials beyond presentation materials (for example, more than a Power Point presentation for the session)?
- I was asked to prepare, or help prepare, reading materials for participants, with which they could prepare themselves with basic knowledge.
- I was asked to prepare, or help prepare, reference materials to be used in the work after the session, or to indicate where to find these materials.
- The session was for experts, and there was no need for any pre-session or post-session materials.
- There was no particular request for materials other than the materials for presentation.

(iii) Was the level of the knowledge/expertise of participants clearly provided to you prior to the event?
- Yes, and I prepared for that audience.
- Not really. I prepared what I could in a given timeframe.
- There was a mixture in the levels of knowledge/expertise of the participants due to the way the event was organized.

(iv) How interactive were the participants during the sessions?
- There was active participation in the discussions by many of the participants.
- There were questions and discussions, but it seemed these were mostly raised by other experts and presenters, rather than by the participants.
- The session was organized in such a way that only exchanges of views among experts were relevant.
- There was not much time for discussion or questions.
- There was a silence after my presentation. The participants may not have felt comfortable enough to ask questions.

(v) How would you rate the learning of participants?
- A great majority of participants absorbed the knowledge and/or gained an understanding of the issue.
- The results were mixed. Some participants have done well, while others did not seem to have understood the contents.
- A significant number of participants seemed to have had difficulties understanding the contents.
- I don't know. There was no way of telling.

(vi) Did you receive any communication from participants after the event on the issues dealt with? Please exclude any communication that would have been made anyway (e.g. the participant had to contact you in relation to work). If yes, could you please describe the nature of the communication (e.g. questions on a specific issue, requests for technical assistance)?

(vii) Have you been involved in capacity-building activities organised by other fora than APEC? If so, how would you compare them? Have you got any suggestions for APEC capacity-building in this regard?

Annex I. Evaluation Framework

Question list D: Questions for project overseer(s)/organizer

(i)   Which description best fits your area of responsibility?
- In charge of APEC.
- In charge of WTO negotiations.
- In charge of issues related to WTO.
- Other (please explain if the choices above were not suitable).

(ii)   How did you come up with the idea of this project?
- It was what my office needed.
- I consulted the WTO negotiators, or the office in charge of APEC did so.
- I consulted broadly with different offices dealing with WTO-related issues, or the office in charge of APEC did so.
- Another consultative process took place (if so, please explain).

(iii)   Which best describes the objective of the project?
- It was primarily a training of officials not familiar with the issue, or those in need of skills training.
- It was primarily a session for those who already had some experience to expand their knowledge or understanding, for example through exchanges of experience or a presentation on a specific issue by an expert.
- It was primarily a session for experts to explore new issues and gain new perspectives, and for others to benefit from their discussion.
- It was primarily a session for multi-stakeholder dialogue to deepen mutual understanding of interests and constraints.
- It was primarily an opportunity for networking.
- It was a mixture of the above (please explain).
- It was none of the above (please explain).

(iv)   In the light of the above objective, do you think you had the right participants?
- Yes, it was just right.
- Somewhat. There was a mixture of participants (please elaborate).
- Not really (please explain)

(v)   Did you take any action to ensure the appropriate selection of participants?
- By clearly indicating the issue to be discussed in the invitation/announcements.
- By clearly indicating who should participate/benefit from the program in the invitation/ announcements (e.g. the officials responsible for WTO negotiations on a certain issue)
- By having a selection process (e.g. participants were selected based on the applications received).
- None. It was left for the sending governments to decide.

(vi)   Did you take any action to prepare the participants?
- They were provided with the agenda and presentation materials.
- They were provided with reading materials so that they could prepare themselves.
- They were provided with learning materials and incentives, such as self-assessment tools, or lead questions that enables them to confirm what they should learn.
- None of the above (please explain).

(vii) Did you take any action to ensure that the presenters/instructors were appropriately prepared?
- They were briefed on the topic to cover.
- They were briefed on their role to play in the event as a whole.
- They were briefed on the levels of knowledge and types of participants in order to target

their presentation.
- They were asked to participate in the substantive preparation of the whole session.
- There was a coordination meeting for the speakers.
- Their presentations were commented upon prior to the event.

(viii) How would you evaluate the event?
- It went as well as intended. All the participants seemed to have gained knowledge.
- There could have been more discussion and interaction, especially by those who were not the invited experts.
- The time was too short to cover all of the topics or to provide all of the intended information.
- Some presenters could have prepared better.
- At times, some participants may have been unable to follow the teaching. However, it was difficult to assess how far participants were following the session, or to reorganize the presentations to enable them to catch up.
- There was a good exchange of views and knowledge by a mixture of participants and participants learned from each other.

(ix) Have you taken any action to ensure that the knowledge or understanding gained from the event could then be used to their full extent?
- Materials and documents used during the session were provided to all the participants and/or made available on a website.
- Participants were provided with reference materials, beyond those used in the event, for use in their future work, and/or informed of where to find such reference materials.
- A contact list of participants and experts was provided.
- It was made clear to participants where or whom to contact if they needed further assistance on specific issues, including institutions (e.g. an academic institution or international organization).
- Follow-up activities were undertaken with individual participants (please explain).

(x) Have the project outputs been disseminated widely to benefit others who did not participate in the project event?
- The project was too specific or technical for wider dissemination of outputs.
- The outputs were not made suitable for dissemination.
- The outputs were made suitable for wider dissemination.

If the outputs were disseminated widely, could you describe how it was done?

(xi) Was any particular effort made to maintain the network of participants and experts after the event?

(xii) How would you evaluate the contribution of the project in relation to the implementation of WTO agreements and the promotion of WTO negotiations, the Doha Development Agenda and other trade liberalization and facilitation measures?
- The project has contributed to promoting the WTO Doha negotiations and the Doha Development Agenda.
- The project has contributed to the ability of participating economies to implement WTO agreements.

- The project has contributed to promoting other trade liberalization or facilitation measures.
- The project does not seem to have contributed to any of the above.

Could you please briefly explain how and in what aspect the project made such contributions, or why it did not?

(xiii) What was your experience of proposing and organizing the event in terms of your organisational capacity'?
- I found it too taxing, and although it was useful, I may hesitate to propose another event because it was too much work.
- I have found it a tough but rewarding experience. I would not hesitate to propose another event if there is anything useful or interesting to be learned.
- I found it a bit too much. I would propose an event again if some parts of it could be outsourced or if some other measures could be taken to lighten the burden.
- It would have been helpful if there were a prototype or organization manual for seminars, workshops and training sessions.

(xiv) Did you use outside help in organizing the event, or would you have liked to?
- The substantive preparation of the event was, or could be, assisted, for example by an academic institution or a consultant firm. (If so, any preference?)
- The logistical preparation of the event was largely assumed, or could be assumed, by the secretariat or a specialist enterprise. (If so, any preference?)
- I believe the organizer(s) should do all the preparatory work in order to ensure ownership of the project.

(xv) Do you have any suggestions based on your experience as to how to improve WTOCBG capacity-building activities?

(xvi) Was the project evaluated? If so, did you use the format in the 2002 Guidebook on APEC Projects (Annex F3)?
- Yes, it was evaluated using the format provided in the Guidebook.
- Yes, it was evaluated but not using the format in the Guidebook.
- No evaluation was conducted with participants.

How was the evaluation conducted if the Guidebook format was not used? If no evaluation was conducted, why not? Were there any problems with, or do you have any suggestions about, the evaluation method or the format provided in the Guidebook?

(xvii) Have the results of the evaluation been disseminated through APEC fora and/or the website? If not, why not? Do you have any suggestions as to how to use the evaluation results more effectively?

National evaluation report by Peru
on
APEC/WTO Capacity-Building: WTO Overview of Negotiations Agreements

* * *

A. Background

The Seminar "APEC/WTO Capacity-Building: WTO Overview of Negotiations Agreements" was organized by the former Vice Ministry of Integration and International Trade Negotiations of Peru (now Vice Ministry of Foreign Trade). It was held on the 11th and 12th of June 2002, in Lima, Peru.

The Seminar officially comprised a two-evening conference on the WTO and two two-day parallel workshops about WTO Agreements on Agriculture and Services which were held during the day.

Aims

The objectives of the conference and the services and agriculture workshops were to explain the Multilateral Trade System and the WTO agreements and to build awareness and comprehensive understanding among the government, private and academic sectors of the importance and benefits of implementing the WTO Agreements.

The two-day conference allowed the public, private and academic sectors to learn about: a) the importance of the WTO for the international trading system, b) the benefits derived from the implementation of the WTO agreements, and c) the Doha Development Agenda and its aftermath. The conference also served as a medium for networking between the public, private and academic sectors.

The workshops analyzed the problems encountered by APEC developing economies in implementing the agreements and in evaluating the potential of the new round of negotiations.

The conference was aimed at the general public, while the two workshops were only for government officials involved in WTO issues.

The speakers were well-known experts on WTO issues who contributed to a deeper understanding of each of the WTO Agreements.

The key-note speaker also participated in two dialogues with high-level public and private officials and in a conference at the Catholic University of Peru.

B. Assessment

1. Needs and relevance

Analyze:
What was the motivation behind this project? How was the project based on needs, and of whom? How were these needs assessed?

Annex II.A. National evaluation report — Peru

The objectives of the conference and the services and agriculture workshops are explained above.

The organizers considered that it was important to remove impediments to implement WTO agreements by first sensitising public officials and the business/private sector about the difficulties for developing economies of implementing WTO agreements and the benefits of implementation for the economy.

The original proposal came from the APEC office and was enthusiastically embraced by the WTO office. The main motivations for the events were the upcoming Doha Development Agenda (DDA) negotiations and the need to be prepared for them as well, as the pressing need to build up a supporting constituency from both public sector institutions dealing with WTO issues and the business and academic communities. These were needs perceived by APEC and WTO offices at the Ministry, based mostly on the experience of WTO officials.

Among the many potential topics, agriculture and services were defined as most pressing by the organizers (from both APEC and WTO offices): agriculture because of its importance for APEC developing economies, and services because of the novelty of the subject in the WTO negotiation process.

2. Design

Analyze:
Was the project designed with:
- *a clear purpose,*
- *the audience clearly targeted, and*
- *the most appropriate format for this content and audience?*

The project was designed with clear purposes, as described above.

The audience consisted of:
1. Officials from public sector institutions as the main direct beneficiaries. They were expected to learn the importance and benefits for their institutions and their economies of the implementation of the WTO agreements. The organizers also anticipated that these officials would gain knowledge additional to any previous WTO expertise acquired through their daily work.
2. Participants from the business/private sector, who were expected to gain substantial awareness of the additional benefits to business of the implementation of WTO agreements, thus creating an important constituency to support the implementation of WTO agreements, as well as of the relevance of the WTO.
3. Academics, who were present to take the opportunity to be updated on current ideas about the implementation of WTO agreements and future prospects.

Based on the responses of the participants to the questionnaire conducted for this first-stage evaluation, it appears that the audience was well targeted. 50% of participants considered that their participation was aimed at expanding their knowledge, and 33% considered that the project was better than expected, although 50% felt that a more in-depth analysis could have improved it. Moreover, 50% considered that all of the sessions and contents were directly relevant to their job and a further 33% replied that the sessions were very relevant. These results suggest that the project was rightly designed for the audience who actually participated.

After working with several formats and because of the amount of time needed to develop the project, as well as the constraints arising from the budget and domestic regulations, it was decided that general evening conferences open to the public and specialized workshops (on agriculture and service sectors) were the best methods of maximizing the benefits of the project.

3. Preparation

Analyze:
Were the right participants selected? Were their responsibilities and levels of expertise appropriate? Did they match the profile that was established for this project?

The organizers asked public, private and academic institutions in Peru to nominate participants. Similar invitations were also sent to other APEC member economies through the relevant APEC contact points.

Regretfully, the participation of APEC economy participants in the conference and workshops was very limited, despite the fact that the organizers sent several communications.

However the responses to the questionnaire indicate that the participants were well chosen. All of the respondents stated that they were either expert on the topic or that they dealt with WTO and/ or APEC issues. 83% of the respondents attended the activity to increase their knowledge. In addition, 66% of the respondents regularly use the knowledge they acquired at the seminar, while 33% occasionally use this knowledge.

From the supervisors' perspective, 50% sent the official to familiarize with the issue, while the other 50% sent participants with some knowledge on the issue. After the event, at least one of the participants was assigned WTO issues as new responsibility, while, at least another participant sometimes uses the skill acquired, and at least one other took new initiatives thanks to the seminar. 75% stated that there had been a noticeable change in the behavior and/or responsibilities of the participants after the event.

There is thus some evidence that the right participants were selected, since they already had some expertise on the issue and wanted to deepen their knowledge. This result may have been partly due to the clear indications of the contents of the seminar and also, perhaps, to the first-rate/well-known speakers.

Analyze:
Was any action taken to prepare the participants? Was the material given to them prepared in formats that were easy to use? Were any incentives provided to participants to encourage them to prepare themselves properly?

Since the participants were knowledgeable about the issue, there was little need for preparation. Materials prepared by the speakers were distributed to participants at the seminar. Although 33% of participants claimed in the questionnaire that they did not receive the materials, they were referring to not having received them prior to the event.

Although the organizers did not send participants the materials before the seminar but distributed them at the seminar, the agenda, which clearly stated the topics to be covered, was sent beforehand.

Analyze:
Was the substantive content of the event sufficiently well prepared? Were the materials, presentations and coordination of presenters/instructors well prepared and managed?

The substantive content was well prepared and the participants were pleased with all the speakers, stating that they were excellent and the right people to cover the topic.

The organizers informed the speakers about their roles in both the day workshops (for the main speaker) and evening conferences. One of the speakers said that s/he was only given the topics to speak about (due to the late involvement of the speaker), while the other stated that the purpose of

the whole program and his/her role to play in it were explained.

The speakers prepared the materials in accordance with the instructions given to them, which were to provide a wide coverage of the different topics they were asked to talk about. One of the speakers was asked to prepare reading materials for participants, while the other was only requested to prepare materials for the presentations. The materials prepared by the speakers were based only on the topics of their assigned presentations; they were not informed of the level of the participants.

50% of participants considered that the coverage of the topics provided in the materials was not enough.

4. Implementation

Analyze:
Was the project delivered in such a way as to meet participant's needs? Were the format and contents the most appropriate for the purpose?

The issues to be covered in the workshops and the conferences were defined by the officials of the WTO and APEC units, based on their experience and knowledge of what was most needed by participants and of the perceived difficulties of the WTO negotiations.

The format and contents were appropriate. The format of the workshops (two running in parallel, one on agriculture and the other on services) enabled officials to attend according to their areas of interest. In the case of the workshop on services, the Peruvian participants attended only those sessions they were interested in for professional or personal reasons. The conferences served to inform business people and academics about the importance of the WTO negotiations and about the latest developments, and helped to raise awareness among them about the need to follow the progress of the negotiations.

The participants stated that, in the main, the events lived up to their expectations. 50% of respondents were eager to learn more about the topics covered. Most of the participants also considered that the topics were relevant to their jobs.

The speakers found that there was participation in most of the sessions since most of the participants had some knowledge of the issues and were able to absorb the information provided in the materials and the presentations quickly.

Analyze:
What was the quality of delivery? Were any problems encountered? How did the presenters/ instructors perform?

From the point of view of the participants, the delivery of the event was very smooth. The few small logistical problems encountered were solved efficiently and expeditiously. The presenters delivered what was requested from them very capably.

The participants considered that all presenters were first-rate and were interested enough to ask them questions. 50% of the participants responded to the questionnaire stated that they frequently asked questions or expressed opinions, and 33% replied that they occasionally asked questions or expressed opinions.

The speakers found that there was participation in most of the presentations since most of the participants had some knowledge of the issues or were able to absorb the information provided in the materials and the presentations.

xxiii

Overall, the organizer rated the discussions and interactions as valuable, but they could have been more intense. On the other hand, through random visit to the meeting room and observations to the audience at the conferences, the organizer could ascertain that most of the participants and public attending the conferences were very engaged in the presentations.

5. Follow-up

Analyze:
What efforts, if any, were made to ensure that participants used the knowledge gained after the event? Were these efforts effective?

The organizers provided the materials used in the workshops to participants for all the topics covered. Many participants stated they have been able to use the materials provided in performing their jobs.

One of the speakers exchanged communications with the participants. In his reply to the questionnaire he stated:

"Since the event, from time to time I have had visitors in Washington who attended the event, or people I met during my stay in Peru. I have also answered some emails from people who attended. During that trip, I made several additional presentations, at the University of Peru and to government officials, and several people asked me about points I had made at the event itself, especially my adamant pro-free-trade stance. I may have convinced some of them!"

Analyze:
What efforts, if any, were made to build not only individual capacity but also institutional capacity? Were these efforts effective?

The organizers sent invitations to institutions stating the aims and the speakers, as well as a detailed agenda which included the topics to be covered. By doing so, the organizers aimed to encourage the institutions to send those officials whose roles were most related to the topics and therefore to build capacity in their institutions. This aim was successfully achieved, since most of the participants shared, in some way or another, the materials received and the experiences gained. This assertion is supported by the responses of the supervisors, who have stated that the participants shared the information and/or reported to the supervisor.

Most of the participants who responded were still working at the same institution that sent them to the events, which were held in June 2002.

Analyze:
What efforts, if any, were made to build and manage the knowledge accumulated for use by APEC economies at a later time? Were the project outputs later put to appropriate use or disseminated widely?

The evaluation report states that the results of the evening conference were disseminated in the press (both written and television). In addition, the documents [of the workshops] were posted on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Trade.

6. Impact

Analyze:
Does the project appear to have caused any changes in the behaviour or responsibilities of the participants? Was the event relevant to the jobs of the participants, or have participants changed job to become responsible for the issues? Have the participants taken any action that relates to the

implementation of WTO agreements, the Doha Development Agenda negotiations or other measures that promote them?

The seminars have increased the capacity of the participants. All of the respondents to the questionnaire have used the materials given to them, have shared or used the materials with their colleagues or have informed their colleagues about them, have used the acquired knowledge in their jobs and have been able to take action on the issues covered in the seminar. Concrete examples given by participants included were:

- *Active participation in the Cancun ministerial meeting, General Council meetings, CNC meetings and the WTO/ADPIC Council.*
- *Coordination of different Peruvian proposals in the WTO negotiations.*
- *Coordination with the private sector regarding its involvement with WTO themes.*
- *We receive documents related to the WTO about which we have to provide our institution's comments.*
- *I participate in the preparation of national proposals on topics related to the Agricultural Committee on market access, internal subsidies and export subsidies.*
- *Responses to legal enquiries*

Supervisors have concluded that the seminars were useful, since participants have been able to apply the knowledge acquired in their everyday jobs, participated in WTO negotiations or drafted proposals.

The speakers' perception was that most of the participants were able to absorb the information provided.

From the organizers' point of view, the seminar has contributed to the promotion and dissemination of information about the WTO DDA and its negotiations.

7. Future direction and role

Analyze:
Was there any element that might have discouraged those from developing economies from proposing projects? Were any difficulties encountered in proposing a project, conceptualizing it or making commitments to implement it? Were any changes in the modus operandi suggested?

The whole process was cumbersome and taxing, since very few officials were involved in all the stages of the seminar. The logistics, preparation, implementation and evaluation demanded time and energy from the organizers, who at the same time had to take care of their regular duties. Limited support from the organizing institution and its lack of resources meant that additional time and effort were required from the organizers. This may be a very important reason why we have not attempted to propose new activities.

Proposing the project, it being the first, took an inordinate amount of time and thinking in order that it would be meaningful and relevant for member economies.

As mentioned above, the only committed officials were the organizers, who received limited support.

Changes in the modus operandi are difficult to identify. On the one hand, APEC requirements and controls seem reasonable, but quite demanding. On the other hand, simplifying or reducing them could limit the capacity of APEC's Budget and Management Committee and other officials to identify valuable projects.

In order to lighten the load, outsourcing can be of great help, especially for the logistical aspects.

We had to use this service ourselves.

From the reply to the questionnaire by the organizer:

• Organizers have to coordinate and direct all aspects of the event. However, it is a burden in the case of Peru, since there are a lot of aspects that have to be coordinated with different offices within and outside the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism.

• Unless both the APEC and the WTO offices are really committed to both the logistical and substantive aspects, in the end the more committed side ends up with most of the work.

Analyze:
Did the project involve the kind of activities that are most appropriate to the APEC context? Are there any similar activities conducted by others that would make these activities redundant? What would be the most fitting role of APEC in the context of global WTO-related capacity-building? To what kind of demand for capacity building could APEC most appropriately respond?

Responses from participants who had an experience of participating in similar activities*:
• *Each seminar had equal importance for my job.*
• *Since WTO issues are developing, both the basic training and training on new issues are important for the job. The more topics and information we are familiar with, the better proposals we can draft. And we believe these training courses will benefit individuals and facilitate the process of WTO negotiation.*
• *It is important to be familiar with the topics being dealt with at the WTO and, in particular, those related to services and others. This is crucial, especially for Peru, which is deepening its trade integration through subscription to Trade Agreements (FTAs; it is especially important to know about these topics when providing opinions on the part of the institutions dealing with bilateral and multilateral negotiations, since the WTO agreements provide a framework for these negotiations.*

*These activities included:
• "Main challenges for Andean countries in the WTO Agricultural Negotiations" by the Andean Community
• "Strengthening the capacity for economic analysis of the WTO Agreements" by Proyecto Crecer/USAID
• "The Status Quo of Doha Round of Agriculture Negotiation" and "WTO capacity-building course: Trade & environment issues in the WTO" organized by the Taiwan Institute of Economic Research, Chinese Taipei

Responses from the supervisors:
• *We consider it important to deepen these themes and to continue to increase the capacity of the sectors [institutions] on issues related to trade integration, given the Bogor Goals 2010 (developed economies) and 2020 (developing economies). This will enable support for the integration of the free-trade area of the Asia Pacific.*
• *It is hoped that APEC will contribute to strengthening the negotiation capabilities of developing countries. In this regard, it would be convenient if APEC organized and financed workshops, courses, seminars and conferences for negotiators from the capitals about the different Geneva negotiation themes, which will enable them to participate later in meetings of the respective Committees, Councils, General Council, CNC, negotiating groups etc., depending on the theme being dealt with.*
• *There should be a topic focused on] "How to facilitate the trade issue in APEC area, or the process of negotiation process of WTO by APEC".*
• *Furthermore, APEC capacity-building activities should avoid duplicating the work that the other organizations have done.*

Responses from the speakers:

- *"The closest analogue was teaching a section of an M.A. course in Barbados to senior officials (on leave) throughout the Caribbean. It's hard to compare that experience to a two-day seminar."*
- *"Yes, I have been involved in capacity-building activities at the OAS and WTO. It would seem important that APEC capacity building be demand-driven and more clearly targeted. In the case of the services seminar in Lima, a general presentation of the disciplines in the GATS and other regional trade agreements would have been sufficient, given the background of the participants. Instead, the presenters were also asked to deal with sectoral issues (construction services, transportation services, etc.). I did not see any demand for that kind of presentation."*

Analyze:
Was the evaluation of the project properly conducted and the outcomes disseminated in order to profit from the lessons learned? If not, what problems were encountered? How could the situation be improved?

These questions were not in the questionnaire provided to the organizers. However, the project was evaluated in accordance with the Guidebook. The information was posted on the website of the Ministry. As far as I remember, at that time (2002) the APEC website was not capable of posting these materials.

C. Conclusions and suggestions

1. The project took a very long time to be developed by the organizers due to the fact that the project was an activity additional to their normal role for all of the officials involved.

2. Circumstances relating to the WTO changed during the preparation period and therefore the focus, aims and formats had to be changed accordingly.

3. Given the above, it was quite remarkable that we were able to hold a successful seminar at all.
   a. First-rate speakers were engaged.
   b. Participants dealt with the issues of the seminar in their jobs and were able to increase their capacity and their of their institutions.

4. Outside assistance with the organization of the event is an absolute necessity.

5. APEC procedures for the approval and evaluation of the event and control of the budget, although recognized as necessary, were an additional burden that needs to be alleviated.

6. Overall, any project has to deal with substantive issues that are of interest to the member economies, particularly in the case of projects being organized by economies in Latin America, since it is quite a long way for the other member economies to travel; these economies will therefore have to carefully consider whether to send their participants.

Annex II.B

National evaluation report by Canada
on
Workshop on Best Practices in Trade-Facilitation Capacity-Building

* * *

A. Background

This 1.5 day workshop associated with of the WTO Capacity-Building Group (WTOCBG) meeting at the second Senior Officials Meeting in Jeju, Korea (SOM II), investigated best practices in the design and delivery of trade-facilitation-related capacity-building. It considered questions such as: (1) key issues in trade facilitation; (2) the assessment of capacity and needs; (3) best practices in negotiation-focused capacity-building; (4) best practices in implementation-focused capacity-building (which, in addition to its clear WTO focus, can also help APEC members to implement their commitments under the APEC Trade-Facilitation Action Plan); and (5) best practices in maximizing the benefits to small to medium enterprises (SMEs) of trade-facilitation capacity-building. The workshop consisted of panel-based presentations and discussions, not unlike the 2004 workshop on best practices in WTO capacity-building on which it built. The 2004 APEC Ministerial Meeting approved a decision to hold policy-oriented workshops associated with each WTOCBG meeting; this workshop was to be the first example of this new model.

While the workshop received most of its funding from Canada through the Canadian International Development Agency's APEC Economic Integration Program, the regional development program from which Canada was channeling this funding was only mandated to cover the travel costs of four APEC members; funding from Trade and Investment Liberalization and Facilitation (TILF) Fund was therefore sought to cover the travel of the seven other travel-eligible developing member economies.

B. Assessment

1. Needs and relevance

Analyze:
What was the motivation behind this project? How was the project based on needs, and of whom? How were these needs assessed?

This project had its origins in late 2003, as part of a search for ways to make APEC a more useful institution for trade-related capacity-building in the Asia-Pacific region. In Canada's assessment, APEC's developing members would benefit from exchanging trade-policy ideas and best practices in regional networks. APEC and its WTO Capacity-Building Group had significant potential to help developing APEC members build their trade-policy capacity by providing such a network, but was not fulfilling this potential because (1) WTOCBG meetings were not sufficiently policy-oriented, (2) WTOCBG meetings were not attended by appropriate experts, and (3) the APEC project-funding system encourages small-scale one-off projects with limited follow-up.

Canada's solution to these problems was to organize policy-oriented workshops associated with WTOCBG meetings in order to provide policy content and attract more experienced experts – the hope was that this would create a virtuous circle whereby the presence of more informed experts would lead to more policy-oriented discussion, which in turn would attract more experts; as a result, a vibrant regional network would be created. We also decided that the small-scale, one-off nature of the typical APEC project meant that we would be better off focusing on discussions *about* capacity-building, than on capacity-building itself – exchanging ideas in an academic environment on how to

program and deliver capacity-building needs less long-term follow-up than, say, a program on improving customs procedures.

The first policy-oriented workshop of this nature was held in February 2004 in Santiago, and focused on best practices for WTO capacity-building in general. Canada proposed several ideas to the APEC membership as a follow-up to the 2004 workshop, and best practices in trade-facilitation capacity-building attracted particular interest – it therefore became the focus of our 2005 workshop. From a development perspective, this project responded to several APEC members' need for more trade-facilitation capacity-building, which was identified by: (1) a CIDA needs-assessment mission in Southeast Asia under Canada's APEC Economic Integration Program, (2) APEC developing-economy delegates during APEC discussions, especially in the Committee on Trade and Investment, and (3) developing economy representatives in informal discussions with APEC Economic Integration Program personnel.

2. Design

Analyze:
Was the project designed with:
- *a clear purpose,*
- *the audience clearly targeted, and*
- *the most appropriate format for this content and audience?*

The project's purposes (see above) were made clear in the project proposal and invitation material. However, they were also rather complex and differed from those of most capacity-building activities. Some participants, therefore, may have arrived at the workshop expecting something else. My sense is that some participants were disappointed that they didn't learn any concrete techniques for facilitating trade. However, this was not the purpose of the workshop. The workshop used a panel format, which was useful for presenting and contrasting the ideas of experts, but did not allow for as much discussion as some participants might have liked.

3. Preparation

Analyze:
Were the right participants selected? Were their responsibilities and levels of expertise appropriate? Did they match the profile that was established for this project?

APEC events associated with Senior Officials' meetings always have participants from a wide variety of backgrounds. A few experts come specifically for the event, but many others are in town for other APEC meetings and decide to attend the event in question either out of personal interest, or because someone has asked them to cover it in addition to their regular work. In addition, APEC mostly attracts trade-policy practitioners, whereas this event would also have been appropriate for development agency officials. In this context, the most to be hoped for is to attract *some* of the right participants, which I believe this workshop did. Several of the questionnaire respondents were able to use information gained from the workshop in their jobs, which is a good sign.

Analyze:
Was any action taken to prepare the participants? Was the material given to them prepared in formats that were easy to use? Were any incentives provided to participants to encourage them to prepare themselves properly?

Participants were sent a clear explanation of the purpose of the workshop in advance, as part of the invitation material. However, none of the presentations were distributed in advance – it is quite difficult to obtain them from the panelists ahead of time!

Analyze:
Was the substantive content of the event sufficiently well prepared? Were the materials, presentations and coordination of presenters/instructors well prepared and managed?

The substantive content of the workshop was well prepared. The event was well organized, the agenda made intuitive sense, and in most cases the presenters distributed useful material to complement their oral presentations.

4. Implementation

Analyze:
Was the project delivered in such a way as to meet participant's needs? Were the format and contents the most appropriate for the purpose?

While the workshop's panel-based format was useful for gaining insights from the experts, it was perhaps not interactive enough, judging from the comments of participants. In addition, the last session did not generate as many recommendations for future action as we might have wished (most came from Canada).

Analyze:
What was the quality of delivery? Were any problems encountered? How did the presenters/ instructors perform?

Overall, the quality of delivery was good. There were no logistical problems, and presenters gave good summaries of their areas of expertise and made interesting points. One disappointment was that only a few presenters explicitly identified what they believed to be *best practices* in trade-facilitation capacity-building. It was therefore left to the workshop organizers to deduce these.

5. Follow-up

Analyze:
What efforts, if any, were made to ensure that participants used the knowledge gained after the event? Were these efforts effective?

Several of the participants claim to have used the knowledge gained in the workshop in their jobs, which is a very good sign. The main follow-up mechanism for this workshop was in the context of CIDA's APEC Economic Integration Program, which is an ongoing program of trade-policy capacity-building assistance for six Southeast Asian countries. The workshop organizers have continued to meet with officials (including workshop participants) from those countries at other events, and have built on the discussions of the workshop.

Analyze:
What efforts, if any, were made to build not only individual capacity but also institutional capacity? Were these efforts effective?

The APEC Economic Integration Program aims to build institutional capacity, and recognizes the risk that project beneficiaries may switch jobs or leave public service, thus limiting the benefits of the program for their institutions. This particular workshop dealt with this problem in a limited way by encouraging participants to share the workshop material with colleagues.

Analyze:
What efforts, if any, were made to build and manage the knowledge accumulated for use by APEC economies at a later time? Were the project outputs later put to appropriate use or disseminated widely?

The final report from the project will be distributed electronically and put on the APEC website. The workshop documents are available on the APEC website at http://www.apec.org/content/apec/documents_reports/wto_capacity_building_group/2005.html . The APEC Economic Integration Program is in ongoing contact with participants from six countries, and some of the participants appear to have remained in contact with one another of their own accord.

6. Impact

Analyze:
Does the project appear to have caused any changes in the behaviour or responsibilities of the participants? Was the event relevant to the jobs of the participants, or have participants changed job to become responsible for the issues? Have the participants taken any action that relates to the implementation of WTO agreements, the Doha Development Agenda negotiations or other measures that promote them?

Participants report that they have used the materials and knowledge gained in the workshop to do their jobs. One of them even reported a specific policy change (the simplification of import permit procedures) that resulted from a contact made at the workshop, although this policy change was not in the area of focus of the workshop, since it pertained to a trade-facilitation measure rather than a capacity-building delivery measure.

7. Future direction and role

Analyze:
Was there any element that might have discouraged those from developing economies from proposing projects? Were any difficulties encountered in proposing a project, conceptualizing it or making commitments to implement it? Were any changes in the modus operandi suggested?

Implementing an APEC project involves a significant amount of work, and for most project overseers this work is supplementary to their regular job. For developing economies, the possibility of obtaining APEC project funding might seem a great opportunity, but implementing the projects is demanding enough that developing economies do not seem to take advantage of this opportunity as much as one might expect. Surprisingly, developing economies may not feel this constraint evenly across sectors. My (unscientific, anecdotal) impression from attendance at APEC Budget and Management Committee meetings is that developing economies propose a significant number of APEC projects, but that most of these are in subject areas covered by APEC's sectoral working groups (e.g. human resources development, fisheries, energy) rather than by APEC's Committee on Trade and Investment and its sub-fora (which include the WTOCBG). Most surprisingly, only a tiny minority of WTO capacity-building projects are proposed by developing economies – most are proposed by Canada, Japan or Australia. It is not clear to me whether the relative lack of developing-economy-proposed WTO capacity-building projects is due to particularly dire human resources constraints in trade ministries, or the fact that WTO capacity-building is not actually a priority for developing economies, or some other reason.

Analyze:
Did the project involve the kind of activities that are most appropriate to the APEC context? Are there any similar activities conducted by others that would make these activities redundant? What would be the most fitting role of APEC in the context of global WTO-related capacity-building? To what kind of demand for capacity building could APEC most appropriately respond?

This is an interesting question, since part of the purpose of the project was to find an appropriate role for the relevant APEC forum (the WTOCBG). My impression is that, while many organizations work on WTO capacity-building, few or none provide a forum for donor and recipient governments

to exchange ideas about how such capacity-building can be improved. As an intergovernmental organization grouping together developed and developing economies and attracting experts from many different sectors, APEC has the potential to make a useful contribution in this area.

Analyze:
Was the evaluation of the project properly conducted and the outcomes disseminated in order to profit from the lessons learned? If not, what problems were encountered? How could the situation be improved?

The official APEC project evaluation has not yet been done because until a couple of weeks ago the project had not technically been completed (the report had not been finished). However, the Conference Board of Canada, which delivered the project, circulated questionnaires to participants at the workshop and conducted its own evaluation. The responses to this questionnaire are included in an attached document.

On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being poor and 5 being excellent, 28% of participants indicated an overall satisfaction rate of 5. 63% of participants indicated an overall satisfaction rate of 4, while 9% indicated a ranking of 3.

While participants ranked the workshop fairly highly in terms of overall satisfaction, they also indicated through comments and rated scores some consistent concerns or suggestions for areas of improvement:

- Many felt that the workshop could have been more interactive, could have provided more practical case studies and exercises relevant to participants' contexts and allowed for increased participant sharing of experiences. Given the level of prior knowledge indicated, more shared dialogue may have been appropriate.
- Some felt that while the workshop was not interactive enough, it was also not long enough to go into the depth desired through interactive exercises and the discussion of more technical issues.
- Logistically, the main concern seemed to be with not receiving reading material prior to the event.
- Some participants indicated that the workshop was directly relevant and helpful to their current work activities and that they had shared the information gained with other colleagues who had not attended.
- Many indicated appreciation for the opportunity to attend.

C. Conclusions and suggestions

See above.