



# “Hub and Spokes” Project Mid Term Review



# Hub and Spokes Project

## Mid Term Review

### 2004/09

Carried out during August and September 2007

by

Freer Spreckley  
St Oswalds Barn  
Herefordshire HR3 5HB  
UK

+ 44 (0)1497 831770  
[f.spreckley@locallivelihoods.com](mailto:f.spreckley@locallivelihoods.com)

On behalf of the:

"Hub and Spokes" Project  
Commonwealth Secretariat  
Marlborough House, Pall Mall,  
London SW1Y 5HX, UK

# Content

1. Introduction
  - 1.1 Terms of Reference
  - 1.2 Background to the Hub and Spokes Project
  - 1.3 The Hub and Spokes Project
2. The Mid Term Review
  - 2.1 Methodology of Review
  - 2.2 Review Criteria
  - 2.3 Critical Factors Affecting the Hub and Spokes Project
3. The Coverage and Personnel
  - 3.1 The Hub and the Spokes
  - 3.2 Project Personnel
  - 3.3 Support to the Hub and Spokes Project
4. The Review
  - 4.1 Relevance
  - 4.2 Efficiency
  - 4.3 Effectiveness
  - 4.4 Feasibility
  - 4.5 Impact
  - 4.6 Sustainability
  - 4.7 Future of the Hub and Spokes Project
5. Conclusions
6. Recommendations

## Annexes:

- Annex 1. List of Interviewees
- Annex 2. Hub and Spokes Logical Framework
- Annex 3. Mid Term Review Question Set

# 1. Introduction

The "Hub and Spokes" Mid Term Review has been carried out by Mr. Freer Spreckley (an independent evaluator based in the UK) during August and September 2007.

The "Hub and Spokes" Project was an original idea from the Commonwealth Secretariat. Following a feasibility study in the Pacific and discussions with the European Commission, it was absorbed within a Trade Capacity Building programme of the European Union covering all of the countries of the ACP grouping. Its legal base is as a programme of the European Union described as "Trade.Com" The programme has three separate but related elements, one of which is the "Hub and Spokes" Project. The programme is principally funded by the European Commission with contributions also from the Commonwealth Secretariat and the Internationale de la Francophonie. The Hub and Spokes element of the programme is managed by the Commonwealth Secretariat (ComSec), which is responsible for the Pacific and Caribbean regions as well as East and Southern Africa. The Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) has responsibility for West and Central Africa. The programme is a four year (2005/09) international trade capacity building project for ACP countries.

This Mid Term Review did not include West and Central Africa. However, it would be extremely interesting and potentially useful to undertake a comparative analysis of both Reviews in order to compare and understand regional variations and to see the possibility for joint actions in response to the Review's recommendations.

## 1.1 Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference (TOR) clearly describe the purpose and results expected for the Mid Term Review of the "Hub and Spokes" Project. The TOR aptly brings into focus the rationale for the project which is based on the incapacity of trade ministries in ACP countries to formulate and negotiate international trade agreements in the context of the European Partnership Agreement (EPA), the WTO round of negotiations, and the multilateral and bilateral regional negotiations presently underway.

The specific areas to be considered in the TOR for the Mid Term Review were:

- Review factors that influenced the project design and determine its relevance, after two years of implementation;
- Review provisions of the Contribution Grant Agreement and based on the notion of "Best Practice" advise on appropriate and most efficient implementation arrangements;
- Reflect on performance of the project and determine whether the project is on track to deliver anticipated Outputs;
- Review and evaluate tasks and responsibilities of: C-AT, Hubs and Spokes, and propose remuneration packages commensurate to their duration beyond 2008.

The TOR then goes on to define the deliverables of the Mid Term Review to:

- Evaluate the relevance of the project;
- Propose suitable and most efficient implementation arrangements based on the notion of "Best Practice";

- Evaluate performance to date and advise as to whether it is on track to delivering anticipated outputs;
- Evaluate and propose remuneration packages for project staff commensurate to their levels of effort and responsibilities;
- Discuss the project future.

The TOR specified 8 countries to visit in which Ministry officials, Trade Policy Analyst (TPAs) and Regional Trade Policy Advisers (RTPAs) in the 6 Regional Integration Organisations (RIO) were to be met and interviewed.

<b>Countries visited</b>	<b>Countries interviewed but not visited</b>	<b>TPAs/hosts Interviewed</b>	<b>RTPAs/hosts interviewed</b>
Ethiopia		TPA/host Min.	RTPA/host African Union
Uganda		TPA/host Min.	
Zambia		Host Min.	RTPA/host COMESA
Botswana		TPA/host Min.	RTPA/host SADC
Malawi		TPA/host Min.	
Fiji			RTPA/host RIF
	Tonga	TPA/host Min.	
	Samoa	TPA/host Min.	
	The Federated States of Micronesia	TPA/host Min.	
St Lucia		TPA/host Min.	RTPA/host OECS
Guyana		TPA/host Min.	RTPA/host CARICOM

The amount of time (31 days) available for preparation, travel and interviews, and writing the final report has been quite tight and meant that the evaluator has had little time to research background information in any depth or to have read and analysed the TPA and RTPA reports and needs analysis. Also, there are myriad strategic policies impacting on international trade for ACP countries and, consequently, on the “Hub and Spokes” project: the evaluator has not had the time to summarise them in order to provide a strategy framework in which to place the project. Overall the TOR was well focused and seemed to cover the pertinent issues required of the Hub and Spokes Project Mid Term Review; and as most project staff have been in post for less than 18 months the TOR was, quite rightly in the evaluator’s opinion, focused on the operational aspects of the project.

## 1.2 Background to the Hub and Spokes Project

The increasing internationalisation of trade spearheaded by the WTO, Regional Integration Organisations, the European Partnership Agreement and the many bilateral and multilateral trade agreements being formed and agreed around the world has exposed capacity weaknesses in some countries. These are mainly small Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries.

The danger was, and to some extent still is, that if small countries do not enter and secure reasonable agreements for their export goods and services they were, and still are, in danger of being left out of the benefits of international trade. The success of many Asian countries to engage in and benefit from international trade has highlighted a potential way forward for small countries to move away from reliance on aid, and into trade as a way of realizing better standards of living for their inhabitants.

While the benefits of international trade for the Asian economies is obvious for all to see it is important to recognise that Asia is very different from the ACP countries and that the history, culture, physical environment, population density and the level of education and technical skills makes for a very different situation, and starting point for engaging in highly competitive environments. The situations in, for example, Zambia, Vanuatu and St Lucia are so completely different from Vietnam, Malaysia and Thailand that just because the Asian countries can succeed in the modern and dynamic international economy does, and perhaps should not, mean that all ACP countries can and even should invest their very limited resources in striving to copy these countries. This sentiment was expressed by many government officials interviewed during the course of this Mid Term Review.

The idea of creating an even playing field through the various bilateral and multilateral agreements is not accepted by most interviewees who work in trade departments and divisions within their Ministries. All countries who participated in this Review have between one (the lowest, in the case of Federated States of Micronesia) and 17 (the highest, in the case of Botswana) staff covering the whole gamut of national and international trade. These departments and divisions send their staff and politicians to trade negotiations with other countries and trading blocks who sometimes field between 50 to 100 specialists just for that particular meeting, which of course does not inspire them with confidence.

The Hub and Spokes project was initiated originally by ComSec staff based in the Pacific region and London in response to the increasing pressure they experienced in supporting small countries to begin the task of negotiating with large and well established regional and national trading bodies.

As was mentioned a number of times by interviewees, "the way some ACP countries conduct trade negotiations was first to hear and receive the other parties' negotiating positions and then make a response", rather than to go to the negotiating table with their own researched and prepared position. This immediately renders the small country or regional body weak. From that position negotiations are never going to produce favourable results for the ACP countries involved, they might, at best, come away with a better understanding of the procedures of international trade.

What was clearly required was for the ACP countries to have, prior to any negotiations, engaged with stakeholders to ascertain their thoughts and ideas, researched and considered what their position is, formulate draft policy and then proceed to negotiate, to their advantage, a final agreement.

### 1.3 The Hub and Spokes Project

While there are several reasons for the inability of ACP countries to leverage the global trading system to their benefit, it has been established that inadequate capacity in policy formulation, negotiation, and implementation, has rendered ACP countries ineffective in their bilateral, regional and multilateral trade negotiations. In particular, limited knowledge of multilateral and regional trade policy issues, inadequate analytical and negotiating skills, poor trade databases, and a failure to involve relevant stakeholders in trade policy formulation/negotiations has meant that ACP countries are ill-equipped to benefit from bilateral, regional and multilateral trade agreements and their implementation.

With this in mind, the Commonwealth Secretariat (ComSec) launched a pilot programme in 2002 in the Pacific and African regions to assist those ACP countries in enhancing their limited capacity to formulate policy negotiation positions and implement obligations arising from these trade arrangements. Based in part on the success of the pilot programme and recognizing the need for a comprehensive and coherent approach, a major trade policy initiative for ACP countries – *Building the Capacity of ACP Countries in Trade Policy Formulation, Negotiation and Implementation (Hub and Spokes) Project* – was launched in December 2004. The project is a joint initiative between the European Commission (EC)/Trade.Com Facility, ComSec and OIF, with the support of the ACP Secretariat. The Project is component 2 of the EC Trade.Com Facility.

The Trade.Com Facility has three main components:

1. Component 1: An analytical component-aimed at reinforcing local analytical and research capacities for trade formulation, while encouraging the systematic participation of all stakeholders in the process;
2. Component 2: Building the Capacity of ACP countries in trade policy Formulation, Negotiation and Implementation (“Hub & Spokes”) project;
3. Component 3: An institutional capacity building component designed to promote catalytic pilot activities for institutional reinforcement in the area of trade support services

The Hub and Spoke’s Logical Framework clearly describes the Project Purpose and Outputs expected from the project and list the key activities with indicators and assumptions. The Logical Framework Objectives are:

<b>Super Goal:</b>	Sustainable development and poverty reduction in ACP countries and favourable trade outcomes for ACP countries.
<b>Goal:</b>	Effective trade policies in place in ACP countries.
<b>Purpose:</b>	Capacity of ACP countries to formulate, negotiate and implement international trade policies enhanced.
<b>Outputs:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Key stakeholders in ACP countries trained and sensitised in international trade policy issues and methods.</li> <li>2. ACP countries supported in analysing, formulating, negotiating and implementing trade policies.</li> <li>3. ACP countries supported in developing national and regional networks on trade policies.</li> <li>4. Effective project management systems operational.</li> </ol>

These objectives adequately reflect the original and current problem analysis and provide an adequate framework for implementing the project.

The Hub and Spokes project is structured around Hubs in each of the five Regional Integration Organisations (RIOs) and African Union (AU) Commission in which an RTPA and a TPA is based. Their role is to provide support to the host RIOs, gather background intelligence for regional analysis and to provide technical support to TPAs and manage financial resources for project activities in the region. They are also, expected to offer support directly to those ACP countries that do not have a TPA (Spoke). This support is in response to the country making a request.

The Spokes are TPAs who are based in host country Ministries who have requested their support. Each TPA works to an agreed TOR (agreed by project and Ministry) under supervision by an official in the host Ministry. Within the remit of the TOR each TPA and RTPA, in conjunction with their host organisation/Ministry, prepares a work schedule and set out the duties for a set period of time, usually six months. This arrangement is welcomed by host Ministries and RIOs as it creates a level of conformity to the overall Hub and Spokes project objectives and allows flexibility and customization on the ground.

The Hub and Spokes Project is managed from ComSec in London by the Commonwealth Action Team (C-AT), a small team, comprised of the manager, an assistant manager, project officer and administrative assistants. The project is located in the Deputy Secretary General's Office and reports to:

- Head of Office Deputy Secretary General of (RS)
- Commonwealth Action Management Committee (C-AMC)
- Project Co-coordinating Committee (PCC) and,
- Trade.Com Facility Steering Committee (TC-SC)

The Contribution Grant Agreement with Trade.Com Facility provides for the deployment of 6 RTPAs, all of which are in place, and 29 TPAs of which 25 are currently deployed and 6 Administrative Assistants (AA), two of which are in place.

What does, at first glance, look burdensome is the way the project accounts to the donor, Trade.Com Facility via three intermediate committees.

The manager of C-AT reports to the Head of Office DS-G which is an internal ComSec line management arrangement. C-AT also reports to the Commonwealth Action Management Committee (C-AMC) chaired by DS-G (RS) and comprised of heads of relevant technical directorates and departments. The committee guides the work of C-AT to ensure complementarity with other trade related work of the secretariat, advises on cross-cutting issues as well as to ensure that action activities are implemented in accordance with provisions of the Contribution Grant Agreement.

ComSec and Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF) have constituted the Project Co-ordinating Committee (PCC) which is jointly chaired by DS-G (RS) and Administrator of OIF. It monitors and gives guidance on the implementation of the project, approves work plans and budget which it submits to Trade.Com Steering Committee (TC-SC). C-AT, along with OIF, representatives of; Trade.Com Facility Project Management Unit (PMU), and RIO Secretariats, the EC and ACP Secretariat sit on this committee.

ComSec and OIF have concluded a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which provides a framework of collaboration in the implementation of this project.

The EC has created a steering committee (TC-SC) in order to monitor the overall Trade.Com Facility to which the PCC reports. The committee is chaired by the Secretary General, ACP secretariat. Representatives of EC, RIOs Trade.Com Facility PMU sit on this committee. There is an overlap in membership of TC-SC, although the status of individual members on each committee differs.

The safeguards inherent in a four tier reporting structure, for a new project, are less useful now that the project has matured and has started to create duplication in meeting attendance and in reporting.

The smooth running of this project is illustrated by the successful recruitment, retention and achievement of the RTPAs/TPAs in the field. This would suggest that the hard work has been done and now the management committees' roles and functions should be more geared to maintaining support to the project and its partners. Now that the Hub and Spokes project is well established, and operating smoothly, this maybe the right time for streamlining the reporting and committee system to reduce the number of reporting tiers and improve efficiency.

TPAs and RTPAs prepare monitoring reports biannually which are then sent to the London office, these are then compiled into one annual report that is discussed first by C-AMC then PCC and subsequently forwarded to Trade.Com. PMU & TC-SC. C-AT also, prepares separate narrative and financial reports for submission directly to EC. This two tier approach creates a

light touch to monitoring that fits well with the type of work being carried out and the level of flexible implementation mechanism being used.

Another important design component of the project is the absence of conditionality attached to the funding criteria. This not only contributes to the light touch approach, but critically creates low transaction costs that enable TPAs and RTPAs to focus on the tasks at hand instead of being concerned with meeting funding criteria; the positive emphasis of the project is on solving the problems and not on meeting the conditions set by the donor.

However, at the beginning many TPAs have had to prioritise the historical obligations of the host Ministry's trade department/division focusing their attention, initially, on filling the gap to fulfill these obligations and be in a position to move on to current issues.

## 2. The Mid Term Review

Article 10 of the MOU between ComSec and OIF provides that the two parties would undertake a mid-term review at the end of two years to determine whether any amendments or extension of the project is desirable.

The Mid Term Review was designed to cover all the RIOs and as many host countries as possible within the time and travel constraints. Travelling to many of the small islands in the Pacific and Caribbean took time and it was difficult to fit in with peoples' diary commitments. All five RIOs and the AU were visited and both the host key staff and RTPAs were available for interview. Out of the eight Ministries visited, which hosted TPAs, Ministry staff and all but two TPAs were interviewed. In addition three TPAs and their host Ministry colleagues were interviewed in Fiji at one of the Hub and Spokes induction training events. (See Annex 1 Interviewees). In all, ten TPAs and host Ministry staff were interviewed, and eight RTPAs and host RIO staff were interviewed, in eight countries in Africa, the Pacific and the Caribbean.

### 2.1 Methodology of the Mid Term Review

The methodology of the Mid Term Review used, as far as possible, a Result Based Project Monitoring approach. This was made easy by the clarity of the revised project Logical Framework (see Annex 2. Hub and Spokes Project Logical Framework). The Logical Framework provided a clear statement of purpose and a set of six Results with each one having a longer list of associated activities. A question set was prepared and agreed prior to departure based on the Results in the Logical Framework and using the EU standard set of criteria (See Annex 3. Mid Term Review Question Set)

Questions for host staff, RTPAs and TPAs varied slightly but the interviews took approximately one to two hours each. Interviews took place within the offices of the interviewees enabling the observation of the physical conditions in which project staff are working and the type and availability of equipment at their disposal. The evaluator also met with, and interviewed staff from, Trade.Com in Brussels and staff from the Hub and Spokes project and ComSec office in London.

Background information on the state of the different trade negotiations was provided by the office in London and copies of samples of the TPAs' Inception Reports and Needs Analysis were provided. There was not enough time to undertake a thorough reading and analysis of the Inception Reports and Needs Analyses. While C-AT provides a reporting framework and standard content for TPA Inception Reports, from the samples of reports viewed by the evaluator, this is not being consistently applied. It might be appropriate at this time to review the content headings of the Inception Report to synchronise it with the new monitoring system that includes standard content headings for both the biannual and annual reporting.

The Mid Term Review did not, however, include interviewing beneficiaries, other than Ministry colleagues, so there is little assessment of the impact the project is having on other stakeholders, especially network stakeholders who will be crucial for implementing many of the trade policy agreements in the future.

## 2.2 Review Criteria

The Review criteria are based on the standard EU method of project reporting. Because this is a mid term review of a four year project the emphasis has been on the lower level objectives of the Logical Framework: Inputs; Activities; and Results.

### The Review criteria are:

- **Relevance** – is the project clear about why, with whom and what it is concerned with? Is the project appropriate to the original problems or have the problems changed during implementation? Does the project still retain internal coherence, i.e. are the problems, objectives, activities, TPA and RTPA expertise and supervisory support internally consistent and mutually supportive?
- **Efficiency** – how have resources; human, physical, supervisory and project provision been used, and value for money?
- **Effectiveness** –the ability to achieve Outputs on time and with the appropriate target groups. This involves assessing the effect of assumptions on the outputs and the ability for the target group to fully engage with and benefit from the project actions.
- **Feasibility** – is the project feasible in terms of skills, resources, systems and external support? Are project staff remunerated commensurate with their responsibilities and are their employment terms and conditions in line with appropriate guidelines? Is the project well managed and able to capture learning and monitoring outputs and make changes if needed?
- **Impact** – the utilisation of the outputs and the impact of this in solving the original problems of inadequate capacity to negotiate international trade agreements, its affect on the wider environment and its contribution to the wider policy or sector objectives.
- **Sustainability** – how the benefits of the project will continue once the project completes, and can they be mainstreamed by appropriate and permanent bodies during the project implementation and afterwards?
- **Future of the Hub and Spokes Project** – has the project started to achieve its activities and had an impact within the Ministry and network partners? Is there need to extend the period of the project in order for it to adequately reach all the stakeholders it needs to? Can the project justify being applied in other ACP countries either replicated as it now stands or changed in some way to reflect this, and other, reviews?

## 2.3 Critical Factors Affecting the Hub and Spokes Project

The project is based on the problems of “Ineffective trade policies in operation” and “Low capacity of relevant institutions, systems and staff operating at Ministerial level”. The project is also tackling “Low level of international trade related skills with existing staff.” and “Relevant stakeholder organisations unaware of international trade issues.” The Results in the Logical Framework also refer to infrastructural issues: “Poor infrastructure and systems

for formulating and negotiating trade policies"; and "Poor infrastructure of organisational networks that support international trade".

While these are the systemic critical factors that the Hub and Spokes project is designed to overcome and which require long term concerted effort, the project is also affected by external and related pressures from the various regional and global trade negotiations being conducted at any one time.

### Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA)

The most critical factor affecting the Hub and Spokes project at the time of undertaking the Mid Term Review has been the European Economic Partnership (EPA) negotiations which all ACP countries are involved in and which has a deadline for concluding the agreement by December 2007. This has meant that at the time of the Review and for a while prior to the Review all TPAs and RTPAs, were focused on the EPA negotiations and have had, in some cases, to postpone more capacity building work until after the EPA negotiations are completed. However, many interviewees were unsure if the EPA could be fully completed by the deadline; this will mean them having to spend further time on these negotiations in the future.

The pressure on ACP countries to complete these negotiations by December 07 has meant that all TPAs are experiencing, and have experienced, the same pressure and same issues. The consequence of this pressure has meant that many TPAs have been thrust into the front line of international negotiations early on in the project and been given, by their host Ministry, the trust to act on the host countries behalf at a senior level. In fact, a number of TPAs have commented on "*when we meet to discuss the EPA it is the TPAs who lead the discussion and argue amongst themselves about the right approach on behalf of their country*": and many of the countries who attend, but do not have a TPA, make less of a contribution.

This seems to have had two beneficial affects on the project. One is that the TPAs are gaining confidence and being trusted by their host Ministries. The other, more significantly, is that this is creating a shared learning experience for TPAs, and also for their ministerial colleagues who sit with them at the negotiations, which is creating an international forum in which critical learning is taking place. However, this is taking place informally between various, but not all, TPAs who are emailing the other TPAs they have met.

This is one area where insufficient data capture is taking place and the project, and future members of the project, are going to lose out on the important learning currently taking place by some TPAs/RTPAs and their colleagues.

### World Trade Organisation (WTO)

The Doha Declarations has been the main focus for many ACP countries when conducting their international trade agreements. For them being a member of the WTO would mean access to other markets currently not available.

The Doha Declaration negotiations have not met their deadline and are currently on hold. Many interviewees believe they will resume again once the presidential elections in the USA have been concluded. This has been a 'blessing in disguise' and has enabled TPAs to focus more on EPA negotiations. However, the Doha Declaration round of meetings will start at some point in the future, 08/09, and when they do they will require considerable effort from the TPAs/RTPAs and their host Ministries/Organisations.

## Regional Integration Organisations (RIO)

Each ACP country is a member of a Regional Integration Organisation (RIO), or, in some cases, they are members of two RIOs. In Africa and the Caribbean there exists more than one RIO, but in the Pacific there is only one. For some countries, mainly in Africa, the overlap causes additional complexity to the duties and role of TPAs. The six main RIOs have RTPAs and TPAs situated in their secretariat, but in addition to these there are bilateral trade agreements that each ACP country has to contend with, and engage in, that puts increasing pressure on the RTPAs/TPAs as priorities compete with priorities.

## Overall

Overall TPAs and RTPAs have to operate within a global framework where priorities are dictated by external events outside the control of the host Ministry or RIO. While this is the real world and enables RTPAs and TPAs to 'start how they mean to go on' it does affect their ability to plan and engage more fully in capacity building. The pressure being applied to TPAs and RTPAs to deal with the 'priority of the time' is an ongoing problem when planning and executing capacity building.

TPAs have also sometimes found themselves in a position where they have to 'fill a gap for historical obligations' rather than build capacity. This is natural at the beginning of such a project as the Hub and Spokes and should correct itself in time. However, if it persists over time the lack of capacity building will lead to an increased dependency on TPAs and a reduction in transferable skills and institutional strengthening. Though this is well understood by TPAs and host Ministry staff, attention should be directed towards making sure that during the latter half of the project more capacity building should be planned in and filling gap activities should be correspondingly planned out.

In relation to the Hub and Spokes project capacity building focuses on working with, and supporting, individual or team counterparts; training and sensitizing wider groups of stakeholders; undertaking research and preparing background papers; and, supporting systems and institutional strengthening. In addition, analytical and economic modelling skills and face to face negotiating competency might also be added.

### 3. The Coverage and Personnel

The Hub and Spokes project is global in both geographical coverage and subject focus. This means that communication is crucial for the smooth running and management of the project. Some TPAs and RTPAs travel long distances for meetings that can involve many air flights and many days spent in transit. The cost in money, time and environmental pollution is high. This, to a large extent, is unavoidable and although the use of telephone, emails and increasing teleconferencing is being applied there does seem room for more imaginative and innovative ways of communicating.

Some TPAs reported using Skype (a free internet multi video conferencing facility) for personal use with family and friends, but not in the office or for official duties. And in the Caribbean CARICOM have installed more sophisticated video conferencing facilities throughout all the islands. There is the knowledge and technical capacity to use these forms of communicating and in limited regions the technology is already in place to communicate using methods that save resources.

In order to test the feasibility of using alternative communication systems the evaluator used a similar product to Skype to communicate with his office in the UK. It was only in Malawi that it didn't work, due to too low band width: importantly in all other countries visited the simple and free video conferencing facility worked well. Therefore there is the opportunity to investigate the use of such systems to support communication within the project.

#### ACP Countries

There are 79 ACP countries of which 55 are within the area covered by the Hub and Spokes project and eligible for project support; from this group of 55, 25 countries and 5 Regional Integration Organization (RIO) Secretariats were selected to receive TPAs because of the resource envelope at the project's disposal. 5 RIO secretariats (COMESA, SADC, CARICOM, OECS and PIF) and the African Union (AU) Commission were to receive RTPAs.

Three of these declined the offer; three had political disturbances and were therefore considered unsafe and the remainder accepted the offer but not all TPAs were fielded straight away. At the time of the Mid Term Review there are 25 TPAs (of these, 19 were in countries and 6 at RIO secretariats) and the 6 RTPAs are in place. The ACP countries not included are part of the French speaking project run by Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie.

#### Africa

Africa has two RIO secretariats (COMESA and SADC) under ComSec responsibility and African Union Commission with RTPAs and TPAs hosted, and eleven countries with TPAs hosted by national Ministries. The evaluator visited all RIOs and five TPAs in five countries.

#### Pacific

The Pacific has one RIO secretariat with a RTPA and TPA hosted and three countries with TPAs hosted by national Ministries. The evaluator visited the RIO and one TPA and used the opportunity in Fiji to interview three TPAs and their colleagues from Tonga, Samoa and the Federated States of Micronesia who were attending an annual week of training.

The Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) Secretariat is the only regional grouping in the Pacific which engages with the Hub and Spokes project.

## Caribbean

The Caribbean has two (CARICOM and OSCS) RIO secretariats with a RTPA and TPA hosted and five countries with TPAs hosted by national Ministries. The evaluator visited the RIOs and two TPAs in two countries.

### 3.1 The Hub and the Spokes

The relationship between the Hubs and the Spokes varies in different regions. Overall, however, subsidiarity, which “is the principle which states that matters ought to be handled by the smallest (or, the lowest) competent authority”, prevails in that the Hubs cannot, nor wish to, impose their views on the Spokes. This is how the RIOs operate and the Hub and Spokes project has maintained this approach. The Hubs provide background research and supporting documentation and, in some cases, direct assistance if requested by a Ministry, but otherwise they work directly to the host Secretariat. The regional Hubs do provide a minimum of project administrative support and manage the project’s regional budget for running events and paying TPAs office costs.

A few TPAs reported long delays in receiving payment to finance country specific project activities including items purchased with their own personal funds. While the amounts were small in the latter case the irritation is large. This is due to the funds having to be channeled through the host RIOs system which in some regions is cumbersome.

A number of TPAs commented that the regional Hubs decide on budget allocation and manage the disbursement, which puts them in a rather powerful position vis a vis negotiating in trade related areas, or in other ways which affect the relationship between the regional Hub and the country Spokes.

The RIOs visited had both RTPAs and TPAs and while the role of the RTPA was clear and their technical assistance greatly appreciated the role of the TPA in the RIO was less clear. In two cases TPAs had been “searching for a role” that didn’t conflict with Ministry hosted TPAs. In some cases TPAs based in RIO had offered to support countries that didn’t have their own TPA and only one out of three countries, where this was formally offered, said that this was welcomed.

The role the RTPA fulfills within the RIO seems quite clear and purposeful, (to have a regional overview and knowledge of how the host Organisation can support the countries progression into negotiating international trade agreements). However, the role of the TPA within a RIO is less clear and does need to be more clearly defined. At present RIO based TPAs are trying to provide support to countries without TPAs but this is providing problematic as the relationship between the RIOs and individual countries is one of subsidiarity, and therefore direct support is difficult. The role better suited, perhaps, is one of regional intelligence gatherer, analyst, and disseminator of relevant and timely information. Perhaps TPAs based in RIOs need to be defined better by having a different title and a more research and dissemination focused TOR.

However, in the Pacific the RTPA expressed the view that they need additional TPAs to provide a comprehensive support to small countries that didn't have nor were likely to have their own TPA.

## 3.2 Project Personnel

The Hub and Spokes personnel consist of a total of 37 staff: 4 in the London office comprising manager and assistant manager, a project officer and an administrative assistant staff; 6 RTPAs, 25 TPAs and 2 administrative assistants. Out of all Hub and Spokes project staff 34 (92%) are from ACP countries and only 3 (8%) are from non ACP countries. The significance of this cannot be underestimated as it is, in the view of many interviewees, the single most important project component that has led to the trusting and constructive relationship between the project staff and the host Ministry/Organisation.

Most good technical assistance and capacity building endeavours are reliant on the people who implement the project, the trust they create and the type and range of resources they can muster in the execution of their duties. The Hub and Spokes project has an excellent team of personnel, very qualified, experienced, motivated and enthusiastic. All RTPAs and TPAs are working in ACP countries other than their own and in many cases in other country groupings. This cross over from one region/continent to another, but within ACP countries, means that the TPAs and RTPAs know intuitively, from experience of working in their home country, what the reality of working in Trade Ministries is like and how limited the resources actually are, yet are still able to come to the Ministry or Secretariat from the perspective of an outsider, which is both refreshing and ultimately rewarding. This perspective of simultaneously being an insider and an outsider has, in the view of the evaluator, enabled the RTPAs and TPAs to bring a deep understanding of the reality to the assignment and a vision and knowledge of how it can be done.

While the initial project design foresaw TPAs being recently graduated interns in actual fact most have 5 to 10 years' work experience. The recruitment and retention of personnel has been well managed and the level of professionalism amongst the C-AT team in London and TPAs and RTPAs in the field attest to this fact.

C-AT's responsibilities have increased exponentially in line with the RTPAs/TPAs roles and levels of responsibility in the field. This has meant that C-AT is operating at a higher level than was originally planned; which was to manage a team of interns. Whereas, because the project has attracted higher calibre experienced staff, the C-AT project manager and assistant manager are representing the project (and ComSec) at Permanent Secretary and Ministerial level rather than Head of Division level.

If, as is expected, the project continues to succeed it will be pushed up the political agenda at national and regional level in ACP countries, and that in turn will require greater diplomacy to sustain and embed the built capacity as a permanent part of how ACP countries manage their bilateral and multilateral international trade. At this point in the project is a good time to review and evaluate the C-AT jobs and remuneration packages.

The remuneration of personnel is extremely low in comparison with other TAs funded through EuropeAid EU and the sister project managed by Organisation Internationale de la

Francophonie. This was one of the most consistent comments made by RTPAs and TPAs in all regions of the project. For example Hub and Spokes TPAs receive €2000 salary and €1,025 living expenses each month and a one off installation grant of €2000; in total €24,000 per annum salary and €12,300 living expenses, whereas in the equivalent post in the sister project run by OIF, TPAs receive €2300 salary and €600 living expenses per month, totaling €27,600 per annum and an education allowance of €2000 per child per annum for up to 4 children. In one example in Africa an EU funded TA in a neighbouring office on a different project was receiving €7000 per month salary and living expenses, totaling €84,000 per annum.

Many RTPAs and TPAs expressed the view that while they find the work challenging and ultimately rewarding it is unlikely that they can afford to stay for more than one 2 year contract. A number of TPAs explained that if they went on holiday they would complete the contract with a debt.

Most personnel are in their mid to late 30s and have family. The salary level of the Hub and Spokes project is equivalent to an internship where the person is fresh out of University and single. In fact, when talking to those involved in the original design of the project it emerged that it was modelled on the ODI internship scheme. Most of the personnel employed are providing a far greater level of professional expertise than an intern could be expected, or would be able, to provide. In addition, due to the professionalism of the personnel employed they have been given far greater responsibility than was also originally envisaged, many TPAs represent and lead the delegation of the host country at regional and international trade negotiation meetings. They meet with Ministers and represent the Hub and Spokes Project and their host countries at regional and international seminars and meetings.

It is doubtful if interns would have been able to carry out such high level positions and responsibilities as the current TPAs are doing. RTPAs have mentioned that some countries that declined to host TPAs did so because they thought they were going to be interns and didn't feel that they could really build capacity amongst host country staff who have much more experience.

Most host country supervisors expressed the view that they would very much like the TPA to remain in post for a second contract period of 2 years. Most TPAs, however, said that they would like to, but because the salary level is far too low they couldn't afford to stay for a second term. The present time, and during the next three years, is a window of opportunity for ACP countries as they are, with the assistance of TPAs, beginning to formulate their own position on international trade vis a vis the EPA and WTO negotiations and then to put in place the implementation strategy. Too many changes during this period might well damage the process and weaken the capacity building so it is important that some way is found to keep those TPAs who are willing to stay in post for a second term.

Support for personnel has been mixed. Some TPAs have found, on arrival, not to have an office, accommodation, transport or equipment. It has taken, in some cases, a few months before they were fully accommodated. Induction and introduction within the Ministry has been patchy, in one case a Ministry based TPA was not introduced to the RIO based RTPA and TPA until they had been in post for three months although they all lived in the same

compound. Again this may well be explained by the fact that host Ministries had thought the TPAs were interns and didn't afford them sufficient recognition and support.

Communication among and between TPAs is patchy and based on personal contacts and meetings at Hub and Spokes events. The Hub and Spokes website has both public and private access, has a document depository section and has developed an e-news letter through which the network is notified of topical events and new documents.

There is a dedicated password protected forum for Hub and Spokes personnel to use, but this has been used sparingly, if at all. Many TPAs expressed the view that there was no real reason they didn't use the website forum only that they preferred to keep their communications limited to those TPAs they actually had met. The problem with this is that there may well be some very good questions, answers and discussions taking place within these limited networks that are unlikely to be captured and available for future use, such as to build a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) site for all TPAs and RTPAs and, indeed, for many others who would greatly benefit from such a dialogue. C-AT promotes and encourages TPAs/RTPAs to use the website and forums at every opportunity and there seems no technical, or other reason, why TPAs are not using it other than it is a new form of communication and, to some people, too impersonal.

Many TPAs would like to open up a number of forums and engage host Ministry colleagues in the discussions. There is clearly a need for a Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) forum as new staff will want to ask the same questions as their predecessors and over time this will become an invaluable source of information. Also, some TPAs suggested that there are certain technical, legal and economic areas that could do with having dedicated forums to exchange knowledge and experience, and to build up a database of specialist expertise arising out of the shared experience of TPAs.

### 3.3 Support to the Hub and Spokes Project

Support to the Hub and Spokes project focused mainly on capacity building for host Ministry colleagues and relevant country trade networks. TPAs were using different methods for working with colleagues; some were working on a one to one basis with up to three colleagues, others were working with teams of Ministry colleagues sharing the work amongst them, while others were engaging in formal weekly or monthly planning meetings with the whole Department or Division they were attached to. In all of the Ministries staff have been trained in general areas like economics or law, very few were trained in international trade. Part of the original project design required that each TPA was assigned a counterpart, although at the time of the Review this hasn't happened in some cases or they have been assigned a number of counterparts. As TPAs establish themselves their presence is being valued more and host Ministries are assigning counterparts as per the original plan.

Many TPAs were unsure of the best way to undertake capacity building. The Review found that TPAs were using a range of methods to support capacity building, from working jointly with counterpart(s) on preparing documents or undertaking research, introducing new procedural methods, changing attitudes of senior staff, instigating regular planning sessions within the host Ministry, sitting alongside and supporting colleagues in meetings, training colleagues in new computer skills, and generally providing frameworks in which colleagues

can more easily understand how what they are doing integrates with the wider strategic framework. What TPAs now need to know is what each other are doing, how they are doing it, and to learn from this collective body of experience.

Many Ministry supervisors such as Permanent Secretaries, Directors of Divisions and Heads of Departments expressed the view that what is needed, immediately and in the longer term, is a post graduate course in International Trade that their staff and future recruits can attend. Many said that this should be modular so that there could be a core course with specialist modules for different students' requirements.

In the Pacific two proposals have been drawn up for post graduate training. An outline proposal had already been submitted to Trade.Com Facility by Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) and the University of the South Pacific, Graduate School of Business for a Pacific Centre for Entrepreneurship and Trade (PCET) dealing with international trade. The other proposal, drawn up by the Commonwealth Secretariat, for a 'Long Term Sustainable Approach to Trade Capacity Building' to compliment the work of the Hub and Spokes project, has been supported by the PIF Secretariat, at the Pacific countries Ministers of Trade meeting in Vanuatu in July 2007. While both of these training proposals designed for the Pacific region are supported by PIF, with modification they could be suitably applied in other ACP countries.

With most Ministries employing between 1 and 14 staff in their trade divisions, and most with less than 5 staff, there is insufficient demand for such a course in any one country. And while such courses do exist in Europe, North America and one in South Africa interviewees expressed the view that the focus is not from the ACP country point of view. Any such course would have to be multinational and be based on a blended approach of tutorials, work based study and online short modular courses. The whole course should last approximately two to three years. Most interviewees seemed to think this would be the right approach as it enabled students to attend while at work and thus keep the focus on practical application, it will enable the Ministries to retain employees for the period of the course and it would make sure that the course is rooted in the practice of real international trade formulation and negotiations as being experienced by ACP countries.

Training for TPAs in upgrading skills was mentioned a number of times, for example two TPAs would like to improve their economic modelling expertise and are aware since leaving University that new methods have been developed and are being applied.

Amongst the network of 25 TPAs and 6 RTPAs there might exist sufficient knowledge and experience to run self-managed study circles where small groups using Skype, or similar, could organize their own learning in specific areas without calling on additional resources.

The idea of an annual get together of all project personnel was mooted on a number of occasions, all TPAs and RTPAs found the ten day to one week induction events very stimulating and enabled them to meet with others and share experiences. Many have stated their desire for this event to become an annual event. From these events TPAs have kept in contact with each other on a self selecting basis.

## 4. The Review

The need for capacity building within Trade Ministries in all the countries visited by the evaluator is as strong now as originally identified for the Hub and Spokes project. Most Trade Ministries Departments/Divisions have between 2 and 6 staff most of whom are generalists with little or no experience of formulating and negotiating international trade policy and agreements. The usual approach is for the 'other side' to put their case and then the ACP country makes a response. The Hub and Spokes project will have been successful once ACP countries are able to come to the table with their case researched, analysed and prepared; thus starting the negotiations on an even playing field.

The *project purpose* is "Capacity of ACP countries to formulate, negotiate and implement international trade policies enhanced." Many interviewees, both TPAs and Ministry staff, have commented on the fact that when they meet at regional meetings it is very noticeable that those countries **with** TPAs come with a draft policy and are able to discuss the issues, and those countries **without** TPAs who mainly respond to other countries' drafts and are largely silent. This was reported a number of times by TPAs, and separately, by their supervisors.

While one of the project objectives is to implement the trade agreements, Ministries are not yet in a position to implement the agreements as they are still being negotiated. Implementation will start in earnest sometime during 2008 once some or all of the EPA has been concluded. Implementation will be as important to the ACP countries as the negotiations currently taking place, and therefore the present momentum should be maintained.

The Logical Framework provides the baseline information against which the progress of the project outputs and the associated activities are measured. The evaluator used the outputs and activities in the Logical Framework to measure actual progress against the planned results.

The range of interviewees across Africa, Pacific and the Caribbean included project staff, direct host Ministry supervisors, Division Directors, Permanent Secretaries and one Ambassador. One of the most striking features was the unanimity of their responses to the set of questions used by the evaluator. Although on two occasions interviewees expressed negative views towards a component of the project there was a one hundred percent positive response to the project overall and for its continuation.

It should also be noted that the conclusions of this report have been, by and large, independently corroborated by senior staff within the Commonwealth Secretariat who themselves meet with the same country Ministries, but at a more senior level than the evaluator was able to.

**The four Outputs of the project are:**

**1. Key stakeholders in ACP countries trained and sensitised in international trade policy issues and methods.**

During the first two years of the project (2005-07) all TPAs and their supervisors have reported and shown evidence of engaging in training, lecturing and organising workshops and seminars with national and regional partner organisations. These have been for politicians, government officials, private sector and civil society organisations and networks. Two TPAs reported up to 150 individuals attending events they had organised and lectured at, and many other TPAs had organised events and although figures were lower it was felt that a fair representation of stakeholders relevant to international trade had attended. The Logical Framework specifies, for the whole project, 600 stakeholders to be trained by December 2007. This figure has already been met; the aggregated figure for stakeholders trained to date is 1220.

Topics covered in these events included introductory workshops on EPA, WTO and regional RIOs, Rules of Origin, sector specific areas, such as agriculture, manufacturing, fisheries, and services.

In the second two year period it will be important for TPAs and their supervisors to develop ways of mainstreaming some of this work to local educational institutions and private sector trainers. As many Trade Departments are planning to increase the number of staff, and recruit over the next two years, there will be an increasing demand for both introductory and high level training and seminars for new and established staff.

**Indicators and Assumptions against the Logical Framework**

The 3 indicators: Ministry officials' capacity enhanced; 600 stakeholders attended training/seminars; and increased participation by stakeholders by December 2007. The project does seem to have met, and in some cases exceeded, these targets at the time of the Review, September 2007. The assumptions have been realised and no action needs to be taken.

**2. ACP countries supported in analysing, formulating, negotiating and implementing trade policies.**

Most of the current work of TPAs is preparing their policy drafts for the European Partnership Agreement (EPA) negotiations.

As one Permanent Secretary explained, "Since the TPA has been in post the politicians now first ask for analytical data before making a statement; whereas before the TPA they used to make statements as they felt was appropriate at the time."

It has been commented on a number of times that when attending regional trade meetings countries with TPAs lead the discussions and those without TPAs have much less to say. In the second two year period all TPA posts currently unfilled should be filled as a priority as it is

clear that they provide a very timely contribution to the present round of international and regional trade negotiations.

### **Indicators and Assumptions against the Logical Framework**

The 3 indicators against this Output are to measure the strength of ACP countries policy and negotiations in trade by December 2008 and 2009. This is still ongoing but evidence from Ministry staff and supervisors suggest this is already happening and is well on target. Assumptions concern commitment by governments to the trade negotiations and this can be said to have been realised to date.

### **3. ACP countries supported in developing national and regional networks on trade policies.**

All TPAs and RTPAs and their supervisors reported either assisting in forming trade related networks or assisting existing networks. The networks mainly cover manufacturing, agriculture and civil society. New areas reported were in the service sector, which is currently quite weak in many ACP countries, and NGOs. Working with these networks has been both informative for them (explaining what EPA, WTO, etc. is and how it works) and has provided problem analysis and insights for the TPAs and their host Ministries.

Many TPAs reported having to support the establishment of networks, but were concerned with their on-going management. Problems encountered were mainly around organising meetings, contacting and informing members of events. As was expressed a few times some members couldn't see the benefit of attending network meetings beyond receiving the initial information about relevant trade matters. The networks do seem to be the right way of contacting and engaging stakeholders, but more thought needs to be given to how to maintain these networks once established and the benefit individual members' gain from attending meetings and events.

While all TPAs had engaged in stakeholder networks and in some cases initiated new networks there was no evidence of stakeholder analysis being undertaken on which to base monitoring and evaluation results nor, at present, is it possible to compare one country's approach to engaging stakeholders with another country. This is an important area and learning how to identify and engage stakeholders will be an on-going requirement of present and future TPAs.

By using the Stakeholder Analysis in the Result Based Monitoring and Evaluation system, a standard way of identifying, recording, categorising and analysing stakeholders, will be operational. The project will have the opportunity to compare one country with another and there is an action research opportunity for all TPAs to share and, jointly develop, good stakeholder engagement practices.

In the second two year period methods for sustaining these networks need to be found and the responsibility for organising their meetings and follow up actions transferred from TPAs to the networks themselves.

## **Indicators and Assumptions against the Logical Framework**

Networks of private, public and civil society have been established and supported and trade policy information clearly has been disseminated. Assumptions concern the support by ACP countries towards collaboration between countries in pursuit of the trade negotiations. These assumptions have been realised as there was no evidence of any lack of support towards trade negotiations and/or the Hub and Spokes project activities.

### **4. Effective project management systems operational.**

The recruitment of RTPAs and most TPAs has by and large been completed with only a small number of unfulfilled posts, inception reports have been written and work schedules prepared, all RTPAs and TPAs have their work and domestic accommodation sorted out, although this was difficult for some when they arrived in country.

All RTPAs and TPAs have now attended a Hub and Spokes one week to ten days induction training on trade issues, monitoring systems and general work plans. This was well received and many comments were made about this becoming an annual event.

The office in London is small but effective and the manager has been active in visiting as many Hubs and Spokes as possible to monitor and evaluate performance against the Logical Framework objectives and to engage them fully and make sure they feel part of the global project.

There is a problem in some regions with paying expenses through the relevant RIO system; it can take a long time for TPAs to be reimbursed money they have spent on small items. A few TPAs questioned the logic of the RTPAs being responsible for deciding and disbursing funds to TPAs' and suggested that apart from the delays in receiving funds it created a potential conflict of interest between TPAs and RTPAs, and between subsidiarity and regional control of the limited budget for additional events and other expenditure. It was said on a number of occasions that the budget was disbursed more quickly when it was managed by the Hub and Spokes office in London.

In the second two year period improved monitoring of activities and outputs needs to take place through the Result Based Project Monitoring and Evaluation system recently developed for the Hub and Spokes project.

## **Indicators and Assumptions against the Logical Framework**

The indicators identify outputs being delivered on time and a good monitoring system operationalised. Results have been delivered on time and the new monitoring system has been put in place, but at the time of the Review this had not been used by all TPAs as the next reporting time is due after the Mid Term Review.

The assumptions concerned ACP countries participating in the project, to date not all have participated and one of the reasons cited were that some ACP countries thought this project was to place interns in Ministries and not, as is the case, well qualified and experienced trade experts. The other assumption not fully realised concerns counterparts being provided and

local costs. Less than half of those Ministries visited by the evaluator have counterparts or provide any local costs to pay for any part of the project activities.

There is no indication that Ministries will pay any local costs and therefore this should be deleted from the Logical Framework. As to counterparts, this concerns best practice in capacity building and TPAs had mixed feelings as to the best way of capacity building with some saying they would rather work with a team of colleagues rather than a single counterpart. Further consideration needs to be given to this aspect of the project.

## 4.1 Relevance

The problem analysis for the Hub and Spokes project specified seven key problems facing ACP countries when it come to formulating and negotiating international trade agreements. These were, and still are:

- Ineffective trade policies in operation
- Low capacity of relevant institutions, systems and staff operating at Ministerial level.
- Low level of international trade related skills within existing staff.
- Relevant stakeholder organisations unaware of international trade issues.
- Poor infrastructure and systems for formulating and negotiating trade policies.
- Poor infrastructure of stakeholder networks who support and need to be involved with international trade.
- No existing project management system in place.

The original hierarchy of objectives set in the Logical Framework would seem to still be well focused and extremely valid. In fact, one can say that the timing of the Hub and Spokes project intervention could not be better. The pressure of the EPA, regional negotiations and the forthcoming WTO negotiations make this intervention a high priority within the host Ministries.

The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the TPAs and RTPAs are in line with the Logical Framework and are both focused and broad enough to create a clear working and flexible environment in which individual Trade Ministries can determine the work schedules and priorities for each TPA and RTPA. This flexibility coupled with the minimal funding conditions, and 'light' monitoring and project reporting requirements, has meant that TPAs and RTPAs have been able to 'get on with the work' in country and not be dogged by external pressure to meet donors' demands.

The one area of weakness is the poor information about stakeholders. Most TPAs refer to stakeholders as civil society, private sector networks, etc. They have not undertaken a stakeholder analysis so while we think the target groups are the right ones there is not much depth to understanding who stakeholders are and how to engage them other than at a very general level. As time goes by information will be gathered on stakeholders, but it is not clear if this information will remain in the RTPAs and TPAs heads or recorded on the Stakeholder Analysis template so other people can be informed, and further analysis on how to stimulate and engage them can take place. Deepening the project's understanding of stakeholders by defining, profiling and recording them will enable it to better target, attract

and engage stakeholders in the ongoing process of learning about and participating in international trade.

The inversion of problems and objectives seems as valid now as they did initially and there seems no reason to change the Logical Framework at this time. In the second 2 year period further and more in-depth analysis of stakeholders would help build a clearer picture of what needs to be done to build capacity in the national and regional trade networks.

## 4.2 Efficiency

The use of resources in the Hub and Spokes project is minimal, there is no capital expenditure, reporting is bi-annual, supervision is local within the host Ministry and resources used for events, training and attending meetings is assessed on a case by case basis.

The one area of high resource use is, of course, air travel; the time taken to travel and the amount of CO2 emissions created. This is partly unavoidable due to the global and regional nature of the project, partly as a consequence of the current urgency of the EPA negotiations. Sometimes face to face contact is the only sure way of making communication effective and on many occasions face to face exchanges are essential for clear conclusions to be made and cementing agreements.

However, as every Ministry visited had broadband connectivity, a foundation exists on which to build a permanent, inexpensive and pollution free communication network using video conferencing. There are systems ranging from Skype, which is free, to more sophisticated and better quality multifunctional video conferencing systems which are costly to purchase and install but free thereafter. The stumbling block is the fear of the technology. A video conferencing system is already in use throughout the CARICOM network in the Caribbean, but is not being utilized by the Hub and Spokes project. The technology is improving so fast that even now it is possible to use virtual technology to hold meetings. In the second two year period it might be useful to investigate better online communication systems and induct staff in how to use such equipment.

It is anticipated that in the second half of the project more resources will need to be raised to meet the needs of the growing project and its support mechanisms. With increased resources come increased transaction costs and caution needs to be taken as to the effect this will have on the flexibility of TPAs to work in accordance to their host Ministry work schedule.

## 4.3 Effectiveness

The project management team (C-AT) consists of four staff based in London. Their ability to manage a global project of 37 staff in 21 countries has been recognised. All start up activities have been achieved, project guidelines drawn up, the Logical Framework has been revised, all staff have attended regional induction workshops, a new monitoring system has been designed and implemented and regular co-ordinating meetings held with all parties as stipulated in the Contribution Grant Agreement.

The Logical Framework clearly stipulates the type of activities required to meet the Results, and while Ministry work schedules have been used to plan and monitor each TPA and RTPA, these work schedules do not differ, in any substantial way, with the activities listed in the Logical Framework. TPAs and RTPAs are effective in carrying out these tasks on schedule and to a quality standard Ministries are very pleased with.

The flexibility inherent in this approach has been commented on a number of times by TPAs and their supervisors and is considered to be a strong component of the project design. All TPAs carried out an Inception Report on their arrival in country and to varying degrees a Needs Analysis. These reports were still guiding the work of many TPAs at the time of this Review and although they are being reviewed regularly it might be worth carrying out an Inception Report at the beginning of each two year contract regardless of whether the person is new or is on his/her second contract.

All TPAs and some RTPAs and their supervisors reported organising, running and lecturing at workshops for many different audiences, such as, politicians, stakeholder networks, in-house for Ministerial colleagues and, in some cases, for Universities and other higher educational institutions. Again there has not been enough time to review all the events supported by TPAs, and the evidence to support these events was not readily available, but at some point it might be worth collecting all this information to see what events were organised and how they were received.

Because of the pressure on the Ministries and the clear focus of the project there were only two reports, from those interviewed, of TPAs having to undertake work not relevant to their assignment, such as writing briefs for Ministers. All TPAs are currently trying to meet the EPA deadline of completing the agreement by December 07, and most think this will partially be achieved. Some examples of the actual work being undertaken by TPAs and RTPAs are listed below and conform to the project design and TOR:

- Drafting policy documents
- Engaging stakeholders in Rules of Origin procedures
- Establishing and supporting sector networks
- Organising and running training for stakeholders
- Assisting bilateral discussions
- Working in country at district level supporting trade officers
- Preparing for and attend EPA negotiations
- Collecting price information from market to share with farmers so they can do their financial planning
- Teaching the use of Excel and other software methods so that the counterpart could do analysis and present statistical information
- Provide very technical support in legal issues
- Disseminating information on regional issues to stakeholders
- Investigating export potential

The consistency between the Logical Framework, the TOR, the Ministry work schedules and needs, and the general state of ACP countries having to meet the challenges of EPA, WTO, Regional Multilateral and Bilateral agreements have meant that there is little or no room for

deviation. Everyone is focused in the same direction which has created a degree of trust, not only to carry out the work but also to build capacity through the working relationships. The majority of supervisors have expressed the view that they would like to retain the TPA and RTPA for a second contract.

Each TPA and RTPA has their own office space and they all had up to date equipment, such as computer, printer and access to broadband connection.

Effectiveness is being achieved, partly driven by the external pressure of Agreement deadlines and partly driven by having the right technical expertise and experience for the job at hand, and being in the right division/department of the Ministry, where the action takes place. The flexibility for TPAs and RTPAs to work to the Ministry's work schedule creates its own indicators against which they and their supervisors can measure performance.

The Assumptions identified in the Logical Framework are mostly being realised as predicted. Some such as "Trade expertise exists at the national and regional level." is not being realised and will cause serious problems in the sustainability of the capacity building once the projects completes.

It is difficult to gauge how effective the capacity building is at this time. There are a number of reasons for this. One is that the pressure of 'getting on with the work' to meet external deadlines means that the TPAs and RTPAs must just turn the work out quickly with little time to engage with and bring along colleagues and counterparts; the second is that there is little understanding of what capacity building actually is in relation to Ministerial departments with a relatively high level of staff turnover: is it about people?; is it about systems?; is it about policy?; or is it about organisational working practices?; and thirdly TPAs and RTPAs have not been instructed or trained in how to capacity build.

Some TPAs have suggested that Ministry colleagues "just don't want to learn" and others have said that "it is very difficult to download expertise to colleagues".

#### 4.4 Feasibility

As previously stated the Hub and Spokes project is at the right time, in the right place, and of the right technical expertise. The appropriate systems are in place and there seems good evidence that new online forms of communication are not only technically feasible but would be welcomed by TPAs, RTPAs and their host organisations. There is general weakness in TPAs and RTPAs remuneration (already discussed).

There have been weaknesses in capturing data and preparing monitoring records but this is being dealt with through the new monitoring system recently implemented by the Hub and Spokes project. The new monitoring system uses a Result Based Monitoring and Evaluation approach and has nine templates in which to record actual progress against planned actions. The introduction of this system has, at the time of the Review, just been completed.

Where, however, there are concerns is with the ability of Ministries to provide resources to recruit and retain more trade staff. All TPA host Ministry Divisions/Departments were under

staffed. The numbers of staff in trade departments ranged from one in Federated States of Micronesia to seventeen in Botswana, the average, however, was between two and six staff. Many host Ministries stated they were planning to recruit more staff but they recognised that there was a concern that suitably qualified, experienced and motivated staff may not exist in country.

Not only is the local skill base insubstantial, but due to low salary levels within Ministries there is added difficulty in recruiting the best available skilled personnel. While this obdurate problem is fully recognised, the Ministries need to compensate for low salaries. To create more attractive posts for local skilled personnel the positive benefits available through the Hub and Spoke project could be highlighted, such as: the opportunity to engage with the large multinational organisations; foreign travel; extra accredited training; being mentored by international experts; very good career prospects; and, the experience of working at a high level of government.

For many ACP countries international trade has not been a priority and it is only now being viewed as important. This is both a weakness in that TPAs have to establish new attitudes, procedures, expertise, and a strength in that there is a shared recognition of the weakness and a willingness to strengthen trade policy formulation and negotiations.

The Hub and Spokes project has earned and gained a reputation for quality work, trust and flexibility, based to a large degree on the TPAs and RTPAs expertise and commitment. They have provided much needed technical assistance in their first one to two years in post, which has been necessary to deal with historical commitments within host Ministries and to 'clear the decks' in order to create space to focus on capacity building. The project now needs to capitalise on this foundation by developing the ability of TPAs and RTPAs to build capacity within ACP countries to support international trade.

In addition to the actual work of the Hub and Spokes project TPAs and RTPAs need to develop their ability to set in place stronger capacity building mechanisms. These might include:

- Better monitoring of project outputs and activities
- Better data capture of stakeholders, assumptions and risks
- Identifying key indicators of successful capacity building measures and applying these to the Logical Framework
- More comparative analysis between ACP countries
- Better use of the online forums and the development of specialist forums for TPAs and RTPAs to learn from each other
- More specialist training for project staff and host organisations' staff and stakeholder networks
- Training in how to build capacity within Ministry departments
- Institutional assessment and strengthening

Project feasibility will also be enhanced through a carefully managed and documented process of transferring from one TPA/RTPA to another as contracts come to an end and new ones started. As there will be many people not extending their contracts beyond the two year period the project can anticipate many change of personnel. The process of changing

can lead to severe disruptions within the host organisations and steps should be taken early on to minimise this. This could include better diary records of events, good monitoring templates completed, good induction sessions for new staff, and overlap of personnel leaving and coming into post. The process of one person leaving and another coming into post should be as seamless as possible.

## 4.5 Impact

Impact can be said to be happening in that some Ministries have incorporated new practices and colleagues have changed their way of working. Both politicians and Ministry staff, it was reported, recognize the value and benefit of undertaking analytical research prior to making public statements or policy and that such statements are based on sound information. Certain practices have been incorporated into the department/division such as using matrixes to record and analyse data. It is recognised that researching, preparing, formulating, drafting policy and presenting it as a starting position that reflects the needs and aspirations of a country is far superior to waiting to hear what the other side has to offer and then responding, as is currently the practice of many ACP countries.

The fact that private sector, public, sector and civil society networks continue to meet also reflects a degree of impact. The TPAs host countries are going to the meetings with stronger negotiating positions which indicates that impact is being realised.

Conclusive impact would not be expected to be shown two years into a four year project: as this will only be confirmed once the project is completed. The indication is that it will be difficult for the Ministries and their departments/divisions to return to a point prior to the Hub and Spokes project.

An obvious potential impact will be from the summation of the policies that have been formulated as a result of the Hub and Spoke project. These will be national, regional and global from an ACP country perspective and may usher in new insights; a deeper reflection of ACP country positions; and, a firming-up of strategic preferences. This is dependent, however, on adequately capturing, categorising and recording the data in a way that feeds into the major strategy formulating bodies such as the RIOs, WTO, EU, World Bank, and the national trade programmes.

In addition, there will continue to be a need to support some of the stakeholder networks. Some of the networks already existed but many more have come into being as a result of the project and are very much supported by the TPAs. Consideration should be given to how these networks will continue, what type of organisations they might become and how they will be governed and administered in the future.

## 4.6 Sustainability

It may seem premature to discuss sustainability at this stage, but as the project's primary objective is to build capacity of Ministries, staff and systems that are sustainable then it is not too early to consider how this project will achieve sustainability. All too often with technical assistance projects the TA is under pressure to carry out all the tasks they can in the time

allocated. This is understandable from the point of view of the host organisations, but it often prevents the TAs spending time, effort and resources on actual capacity building.

Mainstreaming is a more precise term for sustainability and it means to 'incorporate best practice, policy or legislation into permanent organisations as a result of short term project outputs'. In order to mainstream the Hub and Spokes' best practice or policy the process should start as soon as relevant mainstreaming stakeholders have been identified. The mistake often made is to wait until the end of a project before planning mainstreaming.

## 4.7 Future of the Hub and Spokes Project

There are three questions that need answering under this heading, these are:

- Does the Hub and Spokes project need to change to achieve its stated objectives?
- Is there a need and desire for the Hub and Spokes project to expand to other ACP countries?
- Does the Hub and Spokes project need to be extended for a longer period of time?
- What additional support is required for the project to succeed?

### **Does the Hub and Spokes project need to change to achieve its stated objectives?**

The objectives and technical work of the Hub and Spokes project seems to be focusing in the right areas and there does not seem any reason to make any substantive changes. There is one change that does seem to merit urgent consideration and that is the level of remuneration paid to the project staff, to bring them in line with TA type projects and the French sister project where the salary levels are higher. Otherwise there are a number of minor changes to do with the speeding up of expense claims disbursement in some regions, and improvements to the level of data capture and monitoring reports to enable aggregated data analysis and to support the transfer from one TPA/RTPA to another when their contracts complete.

In addition to the existing document repository on the Hub and Spokes website the use of online video conferencing and online simultaneous document sharing might also be considered to increase the opportunity for improved and more frequent communication.

There also needs to be more emphasis on the actual process of capacity building lest it slips by without taking place.

The changes that need to be made are:

- Increase the salary of TPAs
- Speed up the disbursement of funds to TPAs for small expenditure items
- Improve the data capture and monitoring of the project
- Design and put in place a procedure for transferring from one TPA/RTPA to another
- Improve global communication

### **Is there a need and desire for the Hub and Spokes project to expand to other ACP countries?**

Many RTPAs reported that they had received requests from countries without TPAs to have one attached to their trade Ministry. This, it was reported, was due to the quality of work currently being done by TPAs and their obvious ability to negotiate for better conditions from the EPA negotiations. From other accounts the indication is that ACP countries would very much like to have a TPA and would be willing to afford proper support to him/her.

As this is a one off project this is the most auspicious time as we enter a new era of international trade negotiations to roll out the Hub and Spokes project across all ACP countries who wish to receive TPAs.

### **Does the Hub and Spokes project need to be extended for a longer period of time?**

The Hub and Spokes project is now in its third year and is just starting to impact on the confidence and ability of host Ministries to position themselves more positively in trade negotiations. It is unlikely that the EPA will be fully concluded by December 07 and therefore a further year can be expected before it is fully concluded and the implementation of the agreement is likely to take a number of years. Once the USA's presidential election is out of the way the WTO negotiations are likely to start again and they will need some time to embed and be implemented. And, then finally there are a range of regional multilateral and bilateral negotiations that are still ongoing and will take a few years before they are completed and begun to be implemented.

As these negotiations and implementation will continue, for at least the next five to seven ten years, the rationale for continuing the Hub and Spokes project for some years to come is well demonstrated. Now, however, not only seems to be the right time, but, in terms of impact, the only time when the initial formulation of ACP country's position can be established before launching into implementation. There will never be another opportunity to get it right from the beginning, as now.

So it does seem that an extension to the Hub and Spokes project is justified and if it was for a reasonable time, such as five to ten years this would send a firm signal to host Ministries of the seriousness of the Trade.Com and ComSec intentions; and, secure a full partnership with host Ministries to prioritise the support to the Hub and Spokes project and their TPAs and to gain the most from the capacity building measures.

Any extension to the Hub and Spokes project should, in the view of the evaluator, be fashioned more strongly around the concept and practice of a partnership between Ministries and the project to achieve what is stated in the Logical Framework. This would mean focusing the project more squarely at 'capacity building' instead of 'filling a gap' within the Trade Ministries.

### **What additional support can be provided?**

The Hub and Spokes project is, so far, successful and everyone interviewed thinks it should be continued and developed. Projects are successful for a reason and one of the key success

components of the Hub and Spokes is its 'light touch', its flexibility to work to the host organisations' schedules, the lack of external conditions and the overall low transaction costs. Therefore it is with this in mind that the suggested areas below are listed: they have been deemed not to undermine the strengths and good practices of the project and to maintain the light touch approach.

### **Action Research Forums**

The Hub and Spokes website forum is not well used, as far as can be understood from the Review, not for any specific reason, as mentioned earlier, but because many TPAs and RTPAs have their own mini forums operating via emails. This means that useful information is seen by a very few TPAs, RTPAs and their host Ministry colleagues and is likely to be deleted regularly. It is much better to use the formal forum that not only is open to a much wider audience but will remain there for generations of TPAs, RTPAs and Ministry colleagues to use and benefit from.

The ComSec office in London should encourage TPAs and RTPAs to not only use the existing web based forum but to set up new ones focused on special areas of interest, this could be a very valuable learning opportunity that will also inform the project of areas of concern that can be included in any face to face training and information events.

There is both a need and opportunity to learn from the Hub and Spokes project, but in order to achieve good learning better data capture is needed. Action Research is a formidable method of learning if there are 25 + people all doing the same thing in very different locations. Action research in its simplest form comprises a process of identifying and recording what is happening; sharing and implementing best practices and recording results; learning, customizing or making changes and applying best practice to host Ministries.

There are a number of opportunities for action research within the Hub and Spokes project, here are a few ideas:

- Capacity building within Trade ministries
- Identifying and engaging stakeholders and networks
- Building a virtual library of trade related documents
- Building best practice in trade formulation, negotiation and implementation from an ACP country perspective
- Sector forums: services; agriculture; fishers; manufacturing; etc.

### **Communication**

The use of video conferencing is now widespread, free (using Skype or similar) or inexpensive (using paid systems with up to 20 video frames at a time costing approximately €500 a year) enables people to have meetings, training events and regular communication from their desk at times that suit them. Many TPAs already use Skype at home and some had it in their offices and there was only one country, Malawi, where Skype was not available because the bandwidth is too narrow. But with the ever increasing technical advances all countries in the world will continually have improved bandwidth and consequently faster connection speeds.

There will always be many occasions where it is necessary to have face to face communication, but as the technology improves and people become more used to video

conferencing and feel comfortable with using this method the opportunity to save time, money and pollution within a global project such as Hub and Spokes cannot be avoided; the savings are huge.

### **Post Graduate Training**

To create and sustain capacity building in international trade many interviewees expressed the opinion that what is really needed is a post graduate course specifically tailored to the needs of ACP countries. Presently there are a number of Master's level courses in Europe and USA, and one in South Africa. These courses are really not that accessible to many people from ACP countries and the emphasis is too weighted in favour of the developed countries.

What is needed is post-graduate training available to APC country staff that has a core syllabus from the perspective of ACP countries with optional modules related to different subjects and to different regional concerns. This course should be delivered through a blended approach to include: face to face workshops; online real time interactive video conferencing; online shared document working groups; and work based study. The same post-graduate course can be administered through a number of Universities in the different regions and through the online use can be both regional in focus and global in outlook.

Many Ministry colleagues were concerned that students would move on once they had completed a course, and while this is a potential problem if a post-graduate course extended over a period of two to three years then students would at least remain in post for this period. Another way of securing longer term contributions from officials who have received and completed post graduate training is to issue a bonding mechanism to tie them into their contract for a set period of time.

The evaluator reviewed and was informed by two proposals for additional training support. Both of these proposals had the full support of their respective authorizing committees. The first was a proposal for a 'Pacific Centre for Entrepreneurship and Trade' submitted by the University of the South Pacific. The second proposal was for a trade training capacity building model called 'Scoping Study on the Long Term Sustainable Approach to Trade Capacity Building' researched and submitted by the PIF and supported by ComSec. At a Pacific ACP Trade Officials Meeting (PACPTOM) in July 2007 the proposal for a post-graduate training facility for the Pacific was agreed. This is a joint-venture project led by Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) and the University of the South Pacific, Graduate School of Business. This proposal, at the time of writing, has not yet secured funding so there is the possibility of working with PACPTOM in further developing and securing financial support. However, there doesn't seem any need to develop more than one post graduate course that can be customized and delivered in a number of Universities in the different regions.

The data and analysis emanating from the Hub and Spokes project could inform and help build a post-graduate course by providing a range of: practical case studies; background and up to date research findings; empirical knowledge and insights. This information will be specific to small ACP countries and based on their experience of negotiations with larger competitors.

The Hub and Spokes project, as a whole, lends itself very well to being a critical learning source of material for a Trade Capacity post graduate course. Information gathered from the Result Based Monitoring Records will be a source of practical data. In addition if TPAs/RTPAs keep a diary (an online monitoring log) a narrative will emerge to help explain and interpret the objectively verifiable events data stored in the monitoring records. It may be worth appointing a project diarist and translator to keep the narrative, to capture the learning so that the ACP perspective on any post graduate course is emphasised; or, TPAs/RTPAs may be willing to undertake this task themselves.

## 5. Conclusions

### Relevance

1. The Hub and Spokes Project is providing the right type of assistance, at the right time when both the EPA and WTO negotiations are beginning, and in the right Ministries where they recognise their own weaknesses in international trade skills and capacity and very much appreciate the type and style of the capacity building support provided by the Hub and Spokes project.
2. The project is well designed and focused and because, in most cases, ACP TPAs are assisting ACP countries, there is both a deep understanding of the reality on the ground and an opportunity to apply more rigour to the job than would be possible in their home countries.
3. In some RIOs the TPAs seem to be less occupied than their counterparts in country Ministries. Their TOR should be reviewed with the idea of focusing more on regional research, analysis and data dissemination. Or, if this provision is already available within the RIO, perhaps the TPAs should be re-located to country Ministries where there is a greater demand for their services.

### Efficiency

4. The project uses light touch approaches to conditionality and monitoring and thus has low transaction costs. This creates an atmosphere of joint decision making between ComSec and the host Ministries and the basis for a strong partnership for future actions.
5. Communication between and amongst TPAs/RTPAs is uneven; small groups communicate regularly, but across the whole group communication takes the form of information, instructions and notifications. The web based forum is starting to be used and will, over time, become more regularly used.

### Effectiveness

6. The project is very flexible and welcomed by the host Ministries who are able to develop their own work schedules for the TPAs that are consistent with the project's broader TORs and the Ministries' work plans.
7. Now that the project has matured and is achieving its objectives and not experiencing any management problems the four tier management system and three tier reporting procedures should be streamlined.
8. Due to more senior roles played by TPAs and their increased level of responsibility the title Trade Policy Analyst no longer adequately describes nor reflects their current work. A more descriptive title might be Trade Policy Advisor or National Advisor.

## Feasibility

9. The remuneration for TPAs and RTPAs is based on the level offered to internships, whereas the majority of TPAs are qualified trade lawyers and economists with 5 to 10 years' international working experience. There is no annual return fare home and expenses are not country/region specific, but global, and don't always match the expatriate accommodation costs on the ground. The whole remuneration package is extremely poor and it will be very difficult to retain staff beyond their first 2 year contract.
10. TPAs are not using the additional financial resources available to them from the Trade.Com Facility in Brussels. While it may be inappropriate at this time for TPAs to develop new initiatives, due to pressure of the current EPA negotiations, the TPAs were not clear about the procedure or criteria for applying for these additional resources and this needs to be reinforced.
11. Staff levels in Trade Ministries are inadequate to provide a sufficient range of expertise to negotiate fully with the European Union, WTO, the USA, etc. However, some Ministries are in the process of recruiting more staff and they are likely to need support in the future.
12. In-country recruitment is going to be difficult due to the lack of post-graduate level training available to most graduates in ACP countries.
13. Ministries will experience difficulty recruiting and retaining high calibre staff because of the low level of remuneration offered to them.
14. The duration of the project (four years) is insufficient to deal with the immediate issues of the EPA, WTO and regional negotiations, and then to implement them and build capacity in Ministries who do not have, at present, adequate staff levels.
15. There is late payment for small expenditure items from the regional Hubs to the country Spokes, which causes irritation and seems unnecessary.
16. While Inception Reports and Needs Analysis reports are being prepared on time using the original project formats they are not compliant with the new monitoring system which means they will be difficult to harmonise with the new monitoring system.
17. TPAs and RTPAs are not adequately using the project's web based forums to record, exchange information and experiences, ask questions and share data from other sources. There is poor learning from each other and poor data capture and analysis from regional and global sources.
18. The new Result Based Project Monitoring system is still being embedded, but not all TPAs/RTPAs are testing the data capture templates. If TPAs/RTPAs do not use the monitoring system the danger is that this will lead to poor aggregated analysis of the whole projects' results and the loss of valuable insights into best practice.

19. There is too little training and support to TPAs and RTPAs to assist them to keep abreast of new developments and techniques within their sector.

## Impact

20. There are more ACP countries who now want to host TPAs than are currently selected through the Hub and Spokes project. This includes countries that previously declined the offer of TPAs at the beginning of the project. The reason they now want to host TPAs is, in large measure, due to the ability of countries with TPAs to formulate trade policy.
21. The area of operation and responsibility of C-AT in London is growing in line with the success of the project and the increasing responsibilities of RTPAs/TPAs on the ground. It may be a suitable juncture to evaluate the job responsibilities and the remuneration packages to C-AT staff.

## Sustainability

22. When transferring from one TPA/RTPA to another at the end of contracts more thought and care needs to be taken by the Hub and Spokes project to make sure that there is no loss of momentum or information and contacts.
23. There is little opportunity for TPAs/RTPAs to communicate with their colleagues in the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie sister project and few opportunities for any joint work or learning.

## Future of the Hub and Spokes Project

24. There is limited opportunity for TPAs and RTPAs to keep up to date with new methods and approaches in international trade policy formulation.
25. All stakeholders interviewed responded very positively towards the work of the Hub and Spokes project and unanimously expressed the view that the project should continue beyond the current completion date.

## 6. Recommendations

### Short Term

- 1 That the remuneration and living expenses for TPAs, RTPAs and C-AT staff are, as a matter of urgency, reviewed and brought into line with similar EDF/EuropeAid funded Technical Assistance projects employing people with commensurate qualifications and experience. Currently TPAs (many of whom are qualified lawyers or hold Masters' degrees in an international trade related subject) are on €24,000 per annum; as a comparison ComSec operate a band of salaries for TAs from €42,000 to €55,500 per annum.
- 2 That the Hub and Spokes project is expanded to be able to offer TPAs to all ACP countries who wish to host them and that this should be commenced immediately to come on stream in line with the second half of the current four year project. This is felt necessary due to the current round of EPA trade negotiations taking place and the need for countries without TPAs to engage more fully in them.
- 3 That the structure and procedure of the four tier reporting and three tier management committee systems are re-configured to minimise duplication and increase efficiency.
- 4 C-AT encourages and supports TPAs/RTPAs to use the recently developed Result Based Project Monitoring system and fill in the templates and the bi-annual reporting framework.
- 5 The position of TPAs within RIOs should be reviewed with the aim of either making sure their roles and responsibilities are relevant to the tasks required, or consideration should be given to them being re-located to country Ministries who have requested to host a TPA, if no suitable role in the RIO can be found.
- 6 That C-AT encourages TPAs/RTPAs to use the formal website forums for current and future discussions and topic related questions and answers, and to further encourage TPAs/RTPAs and their host country colleagues to identify and develop new topics for the online forums. This can become the projects' action research component and could form the beginning of a long term development of learning by doing and support more formal training by being a resource of best practices.

That one immediate topic to be convened should be focused on best practice in capacity building. This could start with each TPA/RTPA listing all the ways they have built capacity in their host Ministry/Organisation and then analysing and discussing these in relation each others' situations with the intention of replicating best practice where possible.

A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) forum would be extremely useful, not only for current staff, but equally important for the next generation of staff and the expansion of Ministry staff over the next few years.

Develop regional forums so TPAs/RTPAs and colleagues can contribute to and view what is going on in each region.

- 7 The Inception Report and Need Analysis section headings are synthesized with the new Result Based Project Monitoring system report headings. And, that the Inception Report, Needs Analysis, the Biannual and Annual report are integrated into the monitoring and evaluation process.
- 8 C-AT considers using an online software system, such as Project Facilitator, to enable TPAs/RTPAs and the C-AT in London to enter data simultaneously with each other, record, store and analyse data, all in one online server based system.

That if the Hub and Spokes project adopted the use of an online system this could be applied to other areas within the project, such as the proposed development and delivery of a post graduate course, writing up the project as a case study, etc.

- 9 That the title of Trade Policy Analyst is changed to reflect the increased responsibility, and more senior position of the post, to National Trade Advisor or Trade Policy Advisor.
- 10 Investigate how the Hub and Spokes project can use its resources and training opportunities to support host Ministries in providing added incentives for recruiting and retaining high calibre staff.

## Medium Term

- 11 That a post graduate modular course on 'International Trade from an ACP Country Perspective' is developed and accredited in a single University, and delivered regionally in Africa, Caribbean and the Pacific for individuals within ACP countries who are associated in any sector with international trade. This course should include a core set of modules on international trade from the perspective of ACP countries and develop new modules around regional issues, sectoral subjects, and specific needs of ACP countries. The delivery should be over 2 to 3 years and be blended to include face to face class room tuition, online live interactive discussion and study, e-learning study and team working through live document systems. Students should be contracted to stay in the host Ministry/Organisations for the duration of the course and all efforts should be pursued to encourage them to stay for a further 2 to 3 years to fully utilize their skills and deepen and embed them in practical work. The tutors for this course can be based anywhere in the world which will enable the course to call on the best academics and most experienced operatives in the field. This proposed post graduate course should include and build on the proposal submitted by the PIF Secretariat and the University of the South Pacific.
- 12 That training needs analysis is undertaken for TPAs/RTPAs to identify their learning needs for keeping up to date on all the latest techniques and methods being applied to international and domestic trade policy formulation, negotiation and implementation. In relation to the results of this analysis consideration is given to developing and running short modular online training on institutional and staff capacity building techniques and methods for TPAs and RTPAs.
- 13 That clearer information is provided to TPAs/RTPAs on the availability of the additional resources from the Trade.Com Facility. But, that this provision is mindful of the current

'light touch' approach of the project and any conditions and reporting requirements are kept to a minimum in line with current practices.

- 14 That the current arrangement for administering project funds to pay for additional costs is transferred from the RTPAs to a central role in the London office. And, that a full time finance officer is appointed to manage this fund and all other finance matters of the Hub and Spokes project.

14.1 That each TPA and TRPA is given a budget of €1000 for small items of expenditure that is operated on a Petty Cash Imprest System and topped up every 6 months.

- 15 C-AT undertakes an investigation into the process and procedures for transferring from one TPA/RTPA to another, and then designs and puts in place a process that is seamless and does not break the momentum of the work nor lose information or contacts.
- 16 Investigate opportunities for ComSec/Hub and Spokes and Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie to host joint events, either for internal use by bringing together TPAs/RTPAs and their host colleagues and/or for external dissemination of the projects' results and findings.

## Long Term

- 17 That the Hub and Spokes project is extended for a further 5 to 10 years from 2009 on completion of the present project time scale. The extension should be designed and implemented to strengthen the partnership, with a corporate approach to capacity building as a central component. Host Ministries and RIOs should allow time and opportunities for the TPAs/RTPAs to initiate and implement effective and planned capacity building measures within the Ministry for staff, stakeholder networks, and for institutional strengthening.

17.1 That both project staff (TPAs/RTPAs) and host Ministry/Organisation staff are supported in the methods and techniques of capacity building.

- 18 Maintain the internal action learning forums, currently being developed, and expand to a wider audience, including stakeholder networks, Universities, Research Institutes, and to private sector bodies.
- 19 An international trade think tank could be developed by the Hub and Spokes project that TPAs/RTPAs, and their colleagues, might wish to maintain a professional relationship with, and which over time could become a permanent important resource for trade Ministries around the world.
- 20 Prepare a fund to contract writers to collect, collate and analyse the information in the forums and develop the material for writing a series of 'How To' books on Trade Policy Formulation, Negotiations and Implementation from an ACP country perspective.

## Annex 1. Interviewees' names and contacts

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Country</b>
Dr Francis Mangeni Regional Trade Advisor	African Union Commission	Ethiopia
Batanai Clemence Chikwene Trade Policy Analyst	African Union Commission	Ethiopia
James Watson TPA	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Ethiopia
Geremew Ayalew Supervisor	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Ethiopia
Festus Fajana Trade Policy Expert	African Union Commission	Ethiopia
Emmanuel Mutahunga Commissioner External Trade	Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry	Uganda
Silver Ojakol TPA supervisor	Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry	Uganda
Mr Kirk Haywood TPA	Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry	Uganda
Dorothy Tembo Director Foreign Trade TPA Supervisor	Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry	Zambia
Calson Mbegabolawe RTPA	COMESA	Zambia
Cleopatra McDonald TPA	COMESA	Zambia
Shariffa Powell TPA	Ministry of Trade and Industry	Botswana
Kathleen Rubia TPA	SADC Secretariat	Botswana
Newby Kumwembe Permanent Secretary	Industry, Trade and Private Sector	Malawi
Harrison Mandindi	Industry, Trade and Private	Malawi

Director	Sector	
Marcienne Fwkofuka Colleague	Ministry of Labour, Commerce and Industries	Tonga
Adeshola Odusanya TPA	Ministry of Labour, Commerce and Industries	Tonga
Soifulupa Tinai Wulf Colleague	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Samoa
Musubire Stephen TPA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Samoa
Gainmore Zanamwe TPA	Department of Economic Affairs	The Federated States of Micronesia
Jesse Giltamag Deputy Assistant Secretary Trade	Department of Economic Affairs	The Federated States of Micronesia
Dr James Gosselin RTPA	Pacific Island Forum Secretariat	Fiji
Dan Lui TPA	Pacific Island Forum Secretariat	Fiji
Dr Roman Grynberg Manager	Economic Governance Programme PIF	Fiji
Allan Paul RTPA	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States Secretariat	St Lucia
James Maringwa TPA	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States Secretariat	St Lucia
Randolph Cato Director and supervisor	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States Secretariat	St Lucia
Carolyn Tumuhimbse TPA	CARICOM	Guyana
Sheldon Mclean RTPA	CARICOM	Guyana
Ambassador Colin Granderson	CARICOM	Guyana
Teddy Soobramanien International Trade Expert	Trade.Com	Brussels

Dr. David Luff Director	Trade.Com	Brussels
Nimrod Wania Project Manager	Hub and Spokes Project	London
Elroy Turner Deputy Project Manager	Hub and Spokes Project	London
Roy Rodriguez	Head of Office ComSec	London
Arif Baig	Human Resources Adviser CFTC, ComSec	London
Edwin Laurent	Adviser and Head of Section Comsec	London

## Annex 2. Hub and Spokes Project Logical Framework

Objectives	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p><b>Super Goal</b> Sustainable development and poverty reduction in ACP countries and favourable trade outcomes for ACP countries.</p>			
<p><b>Goal</b> Effective trade policies in place in ACP countries</p>	<p>ACP countries' production and trade diversified.</p> <p>Increased intra-regional trade in all six ACP regions.</p>	<p>World Bank, WTO and national statistics and reports</p>	
<p><b>Purpose</b> Capacity of ACP countries to formulate, negotiate and implement international trade policies enhanced.</p>	<p>7 EPA or other satisfactory arrangements, reflecting ACP interests, agreed, signed and ratified by December 2008.</p> <p>Reduced reliance on external support for policy formulation by 25% by Dec. 2009.</p> <p>Bilateral, regional and WTO trade agreements better reflect the ACP countries' interests.</p> <p>Increase 50% in number of trade-related laws and regulations effectively implemented by ACP countries by December 2008. Enhanced regional integration process in all ACP regions.</p>	<p>EOP Review by independent experts based on reports of TPAs.</p> <p>External consultants' contracts issued.</p> <p>Private sector stakeholders support the agreements evidenced by reports and minutes of meetings.</p> <p>Government statistics.</p> <p>Increased communication between Gov. departments and increased agreement of important issues debated.</p>	<p>Trade negotiations are not blocked.</p> <p>Distorted trade policies in the major markets for ACP exports removed</p> <p>Global economic stability</p> <p>ACP countries willing and able to implement conducive trade policies</p> <p>Political stability and good governance in ACP countries</p>

Outputs	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<p><b>Output 1.</b> Key stakeholders in ACP countries trained and sensitised in international trade policy issues and methods.</p>	<p>Senior ACP country trade officials report that capacity of trained officials enhanced. Officials trained 600 by December 2007, 1,300 by December 2008 and 2,000 by December 2009. A minimum of 25% of officials trained will be women. 70% of trained officials report training as useful against agreed rating scale.</p> <p>Private sector and civil society report increased participation in trade policy formulation and implementation by December 2008.</p>	<p>Six-monthly reports of Regional Trade Policy Advisers.</p> <p>Use of after training questionnaire based on agreed rating scale.</p> <p>Minutes of network meetings and related reports.</p>	<p>Key trained staff stay in post</p> <p>Capacity building programmes are relevant and addressing the specific needs of ACP members and are accessible to key staff.</p> <p>Skilled and motivated staff are assigned to trade units in ACP countries.</p> <p>Training programmes are relevant to trade policy issues.</p> <p>Increased awareness and knowledge results in changed attitudes and more focused attention to national and regional trade issues.</p>
<p><b>Output 2.</b> ACP countries supported in analysing, formulating, negotiating and implementing trade policies.</p>	<p>ACP countries have elaborated trade policy documents and negotiating strategies and positions. 25% of ACP countries have achieved this by December 2008 and by December 2009 an additional 25% have achieved this position.</p> <p>Analytical base to inform trade policies and negotiating positions strengthened in over 50% ACP countries.</p>	<p>Trade research and policy documents. Minutes of trade related meetings.</p> <p>Six-monthly reports of Regional Trade Policy Advisers.</p> <p>Availability of data on trade related matters easily accessible to appropriate officials and private sector staff.</p>	<p>ACP governments remain committed to trade policy reform</p> <p>Pre-existing infrastructure for trade data collection in place.</p> <p>ACP members and RIOs provide adequate resources and ongoing commitments to strengthening trade policy capacity.</p> <p>Governments and RIOs are committed to engaging with key stakeholders in trade policy formulation.</p> <p>Trade expertise exists at the national and regional level.</p>

			Trained staff continue to work in the ministry/organisation for a reasonable period after training.
<p><b>Output 3.</b> ACP countries supported in developing national and regional networks on trade policies.</p>	<p>Multi-stakeholder networks made up of public sector officials, private sector representatives and NGO representatives actively involved in national and regional trade policy activities by December 2009.</p> <p>Trade policy data, information and publications effectively disseminated in all regions.</p>	<p>Ease of access to networks by stakeholders.</p> <p>Minutes of network meetings and other exchanges.</p> <p>E-network computer records.</p> <p>Six-monthly reports of Regional Trade Policy Advisers.</p> <p>Sample survey of proposed recipients of trade policy data.</p>	<p>Supportive regional projects funded by governments and other organisations implemented as planned.</p> <p>Network users have access to the internet and computers.</p> <p>Regional and ACP interests do not dilute or prevent collaborative efforts to address trade issues.</p> <p>National and regional interests do not dilute or prevent collaborative efforts in focusing on priority trade issues.</p> <p>Adequate absorptive capacity in ACP countries</p>
<p><b>Output 4.</b> Effective project management systems operational.</p>	<p>Project Outputs delivered on time and within budget.</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation system operationalised and being used by all TPAs and RTPAs by December 2006</p> <p>High quality monitoring reports produced/disseminated by December 2006.</p>	<p>Six monthly reports of Head Office</p> <p>Annual Review Mission assessments.</p>	<p>ACP countries agree to participate in the project and sign MOU setting out their responsibilities.</p> <p>Governments provide counterparts, local costs and support.</p>

Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<b>Output 1</b> Key stakeholders in ACP countries trained and sensitised in international trade policy issues and methods	<b>€600,000</b>		
1.1 Key stakeholders for training and sensitisation identified	Inception report identifies key stakeholders	Approval of report by Reporting Officer	Capacity-building programmes are relevant, addressing the specific needs of ACP members and are accessible to key staff  Skill and motivate staff is assigned to trade units in ACP members  Training programmes are relevant to trade policy issues  Increased awareness and knowledge results in changed attitudes and more focuses attention to national and regional trade matters
1.2 Training and sensitisation needs assessment (TSNA) undertaken	RTPAs and TPAs undertake, or commission a consultant to undertake, a TSNA to determine capacity-building needs	Production of Needs Assessment Report	
1.3 Training programmes designed	RTPAs and TPAs design appropriate response to needs assessment	Needs Assessment Report	
1.4 Training programmes implemented	Appropriate skills upgrading and training activities delivered to counterparts, trade officials and stakeholders	Training Completion Report	
1.5 Training programmes evaluated and redesigned, as necessary	At least 70% of staff assess training and other support as useful against agreed rating scale	Training Evaluation Report	
1.6 Sensitisation programme designed	RTPAs and TPAs undertake, or commission a consultant to undertake, in collaboration with stakeholders including parliamentarians, sensitisation programme on trade issues and gender in trade	Needs Assessment Report	
1.7 Sensitisation programme implemented	RTPAs and TPAs co-ordinate the implementation of a sensitisation programme	Gender issues raised in policy documents	
1.8 Sensitisation programme evaluated and redesigned, as necessary	At least 70% of staff assess training and other support as useful against agreed rating scale	Training Evaluation Report	
1.9 Design, develop and agree questionnaire rating scale for trained officials who have			

attended the training put on by the project.			
Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<b>Output 2</b> ACP countries supported in analysing, formulating, negotiating and implementing trade policies.	<b>€2,170,135</b>		
2.1 Strengthen statistical databases on trade issues	Consultants engaged to review and upgrade trade-related data collection process	Trade Statistics database in place	<p>Pre-existing infrastructure for trade data collection in place</p> <p>ACP members and RIOs provide adequate resources and ongoing commitment to strengthening trade policy capacity</p> <p>Governments and RIOs are committed to engaging with key stakeholders in trade policy formulation</p> <p>Trade expertise exists at the national and regional level</p> <p>Trained staff continue to work in the ministry/organisation for a reasonable period after training</p>
2.2 Analyse key trade policy issues (e.g. economics, agreements and laws)	Regional Trade Policy Analysts (Hubs) at AU, OECS, CARICOM, COMESA, PIFS, & SADC	Enhanced quality of existing trade policies and the development of new ones	
2.3 Formulate trade policies (e.g. through consultations, study visits, providing advice and information)	Trade Policy Analysts (Spokes) throughout these regions  Administrative Assistants at the six Hubs	Trade ministries, RIOs and other stakeholders produce better quality trade papers and analytical reports	
2.4 Support negotiating teams (e.g. through briefings and possibly support during negotiations)	144 p/months of PMU staff Other ComSec professional inputs	Increased number and quality of submissions/ interventions by ACP countries at the WTO	
2.5 Identify, clarify and implement commitments consistent with trade agreements	Awareness programmes on information requirements for notification under WTO Agreements	Negotiating positions formulated within time framework and address key national issues	
2.6 Work with regional technical	Regional organisations requested to	Trade-related legislation enacted by ACP countries within agreed time-frames	
		WTO trade policy reviews	
		Notifications received by WTO	
		Six-monthly reports of RTPAs and TPAs	

working groups in formulating regional negotiating positions	assist their ACP members in trade policy areas	Thorough, timely regional mandates and negotiating positions for bilateral and multilateral negotiations	
Activities	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
<b>Output 3</b> ACP countries supported in developing national and regional networks on trade policies.	<b>€538,577</b>		
3.1 ACP countries supported to establish and strengthen consultative, multi-stakeholder mechanisms for formulating trade policies and negotiating positions at national and regional levels	Meetings of network groups  Trade Forum on Hub & Spokes website to stimulate discussion	Report of meetings  Hub & Spokes website computer records  Feedback from ACP member governments on capability of stakeholders to participate  Project reports and documentation  Feedback and focus group reporting from stakeholders  Regular publication of briefing papers  Local press coverage of trade-related issues	Network users have access to the internet and computers  Regional and ACP interests do not dilute or prevent collaborative efforts to address trade issues
3.2 Govts, private sector and civil society provided with trade information and briefs on key trade negotiation areas	Consultative co-ordination meetings established and discussions held regularly  Position papers on emerging trade issues distributed by RTPA and TPAs	Increased number of officials and stakeholders capable of contributing to national trade policy formulation and implementation	National and regional interests do not dilute or prevent collaborative efforts in focusing on priority trade issues
3.3 Reports and other information disseminated widely (hard copy and website)	Hub & Spokes website  Reports	Hub & Spokes website computer records Distribution list for reports Local press coverage of trade-related issues	

3.4 Project advisers and analysts participated actively in forums	Meetings of network groups Hub& Spokes website	Report of meetings Hub & Spokes website computer records	
3.5 Sample survey of proposed recipients of trade policy data.			
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Means of Verification</b>	<b>Assumptions</b>
<b>Output 4</b> Effective project management systems operational.	<b>€6,720,117</b>		
4.1 Advisers, analysts and other staff recruited and inducted	Interviews for RTPAs, TPAs and AAs held.  Candidate chosen from shortlist by beneficiary government	All RTPAs and TPAs posted	ACP countries agree to participate in project and sign MOU setting out their responsibilities  Governments provide counterparts, local costs and support
4.2 Regional offices established and equipped	PCs and internet connection  AAs recruited MOUs signed Impress accounts established	RTPAs report that Hub is operationalised	
4.3 Project progress monitored effectively	C-AT/ComSec professional missions	C-AT Progress Reports	
4.4 Six-monthly progress reports produced on schedule	C-AT documents project activities over the period between meetings of the PCC.	Progress Report produced at meetings of the PCC	
4.5 Visits to the project, including annual review missions facilitated.	C-AT personnel	C-AT Progress Reports	
4.6 End of project evaluation by independent experts planned and facilitated	Consultant engaged to review the project	End of project evaluation report	

### Annex 3. Mid Term Review Question Set

Hub and Spokes Project – Mid Term Review 2007			
TOR questions	Detail questions	Sources and methods of data collection	Analysis
<p><b>Relevance of the intervention:</b></p> <p>1. Review factors that influenced the project design and determine its relevance, after two years.</p>	<p>1.1 What was the original rationale for hosting the H&amp;S project?</p> <p>1.2 What are the main features of the H&amp;S project's operation?</p> <p>1.3 Has the rationale for hosting the H&amp;S project changed since the start?</p> <p>1.4 Has there been any changes in the design or TOR in light of the experience?</p> <p>1.5 What are the main areas of work undertaken by the H&amp;S project?</p> <p>1.5 Is there a clear understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the host organisations?</p> <p>1.6 Is the H&amp;S project able to cover the key problems or is there need for additional interventions?</p> <p>1.6 Is there still a need for the H&amp;S project in this Ministry?</p> <p>1.7 Is there a clear stakeholder analysis in place?</p> <p>1.8 Have stakeholders been willing to participate in the project?</p> <p>1.9 Have stakeholders attended training put on by the project?</p>	<p>Desk review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Logframe</li> <li>• European Contribution Agreement</li> <li>• RTPA/TPA contracts</li> </ul> <p>Interviews with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTPA</li> <li>• TPA</li> <li>• Supervisor</li> <li>• Network members</li> </ul>	<p>Key findings summaries against desk review checklist</p> <p>Problem analysis</p> <p>Objective analysis</p> <p>Stakeholder analysis</p>
<p><b>Efficiency of the initiative:</b></p> <p>2. Review provisions of the Contribution Grant Agreement and based on the notion of best practice advise on appropriate and most efficient implementation arrangements.</p>	<p>2.1 Is the original TOR still valid and applicable?</p> <p>2.2 Are appropriate procedures in place for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supervision?</li> <li>• Allocation of tasks?</li> <li>• Decision making?</li> <li>• Grievance and discipline?</li> </ul> <p>2.3 Is there an agreed work plan in place?</p> <p>2.3 Is the work plan kept to and on schedule?</p> <p>2.4 Is work monitoring being carried out?</p> <p>2.5 How does the host body respond to changing needs of RTPA/TPA as the</p>	<p>Desk review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTPA/TPA contracts</li> </ul> <p>Interviews with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTPA</li> <li>• TPA</li> <li>• Supervisor</li> <li>• Network members</li> </ul>	<p>Procedures and systems</p> <p>Work plans and schedules</p> <p>Ability to deal with issues</p>

	<p>project progresses?</p> <p>2.6 How does the host organisation respond to feedback?</p> <p>2.7 How does your remuneration and contract conditions compare to other external consultants operating in the Ministry /Government?</p> <p>2.8 How could the procedures be improved in order that supervision and management better meet the needs of the local counterparts?</p>		
<p><b>Effectiveness and feasibility:</b></p> <p>3. Reflect on performance of the project and determine whether the project is on track to deliver anticipated Outputs.</p> <p>4. Review and evaluate tasks and responsibilities of; C-AT, Hubs and Spokes, and propose remuneration packages commensurate to their respective work loads and responsibilities.</p>	<p>3.1 What have the H&amp;S project's main achievements been to-date in the following areas:</p> <p>3.2 Stakeholder training provision?</p> <p>3.3 Capacity to formulate, negotiate and implement trade policies?</p> <p>3.4 Developing national and regional networks on trade policies?</p> <p>3.5 Is the project on schedule as planned?</p> <p>3.6 In addition to the planned objectives have you achieved added value results?</p> <p>4.1 Are you satisfied with your job description?</p> <p>4.2 Are you satisfied with your remuneration?</p> <p>4.3 Are you satisfied with the terms and conditions of your contract?</p> <p>4.4 Are you satisfied with the level of supervision?</p> <p>4.5 Are you satisfied with your ability to direct your work?</p>	<p>Interviews with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● RTPA</li> <li>● TPA</li> <li>● Supervisor</li> <li>● Network members</li> </ul>	<p>Delivery of project actions</p> <p>Stakeholders benefits</p> <p>Utilisation of learning</p> <p>Level of satisfaction RTPA/TPA have and are they willing to extend their contract</p>
<p><b>Impact and sustainability:</b></p> <p>5. Review the degree and level of capacity building, amongst Ministry colleagues, to be able to formulate, negotiate and implement trade policies.</p>	<p>5.1 Are colleagues in the Ministry learning to formulate, negotiate and implement trade policy?</p> <p>5.2 How many colleagues have completed training put on by the H&amp;S project?</p> <p>5.3 How many colleagues have completed training put on by other organisations?</p> <p>5.4 How have colleagues benefited from the H&amp;S project?</p> <p>5.5 What new tasks are being performed by colleagues as a consequence of the H&amp;S project?</p> <p>5.6 How many new policies have been prepared as a consequence of the H&amp;S</p>	<p>Desk review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● New trade policies</li> <li>● Descriptions of networks</li> <li>● New trade agreements</li> </ul> <p>Interviews with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● RTPA</li> <li>● TPA</li> <li>● Supervisor</li> </ul>	<p>Level of utilisation by colleagues of new skills and level of confidence in leading trade negotiations.</p>

	<p>project?</p> <p>5.7 Has a new trade agreements been enacted as a consequence of the H&amp;S project?</p> <p>5.8 Do colleagues feel confident and competent in conducting trade negotiations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Network members</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Lessens learnt and future of Project:</b></p> <p>6. Based on an evaluation of; actual start dates, relevance and impact of the project so far, determine whether there is merit in extending the project duration beyond 2008.</p>	<p>6.1 Has the Ministry incorporated any Outputs from the H&amp;S project?</p> <p>6.2 Has the project Outputs reached the target group?</p> <p>6.3 How can lessons learning and dissemination be improved within the Ministry and between government and non government departments?</p> <p>6.4 What best practices can be replicated and expanded within the Ministry and trade networks?</p> <p>6.5 What lessons can the Ministry apply to improving the efficiency with which it designs and implements its trade policies and negotiations?</p> <p>6.6 What lessons can the Ministry apply to its collaborations with other trade partner?</p>	<p>Interviews with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RTPA</li> <li>• TPA</li> <li>• Supervisor</li> <li>• Network members</li> </ul>	<p>Should the H&amp;S project continue, and how it should continue in the future.</p>