



Data and Methods

1. The evaluation essentially covers the period since the establishment of the WTO—1996 through 2007—but goes back further for some questions and focuses on the more recent past for others. The main instruments of the evaluation are: (i) desk reviews of policy documents and guidelines issued to staff, IMF Executive Board minutes, Article IV and program documents, and advocacy and outreach items; (ii) interviews of current and former IMF, WTO, and World Bank staff and government and nongovernment representatives; and (iii) surveys of IMF staff and country authorities. This annex describes the first two sources of evidence; Annex 2 describes the surveys and their main findings. Annex Table A1.1 summarizes the data sources for the various components of the evaluation.

A. Executive Board Papers, Minutes, and Guidelines to Staff

2. The evaluation used Executive Board papers and minutes of discussions reviewing the Fund's work on, and role in, trade policy (including surveillance and conditionality reviews) and related topics (e.g., IMF-WTO cooperation, trade liberalization in Fund-supported programs, revenue implications of trade liberalization, market access for developing country exports, PTAs, and the Doha Development Agenda). The evidence gathered from these sources was used to consider how the IMF Board viewed trade issues and the Fund's role in these issues over time. Summings up from these Board discussions and guidance notes issued by PDR were used to consider how staff were instructed to approach trade policy issues.

B. Surveillance Documents

3. The evaluation examined Article IV documents (including staff reports, internal briefing papers and back-to-office reports for staff missions, background papers, minutes of relevant Board discussions, and press releases) to assess the IMF's coverage of trade

policy issues in bilateral surveillance. This evidence was drawn from the following (overlapping) samples:

- For the entire IMF membership, we reviewed all bilateral Article IV staff reports for 1996, 2000, and 2006.¹ If a country did not have an Article IV consultation in one of these years, the staff report from the closest earlier year was used. This yielded a total of 180 staff reports for 1996, 185 staff reports for 2000, and 190 staff reports for 2006. Each staff report was reviewed for its coverage of 11 trade policy topics: tariffs, nontariff barriers, export restrictions, antidumping/countervailing measures, export subsidies, state trading monopolies, customs administration, trade in services, PTAs, WTO, and trade liberalization in general. The coverage of each topic was given a rating from 0 to 3, where 0 indicated no coverage; 1 indicated factual reporting only; 2 indicated that the staff expressed a view or took a position on the issue but without apparent supporting analysis; and 3 indicated the staff expressed a view or took a position on the issue with some supporting analysis including, but not limited to, an SIP or recent economic developments (RED) chapter with substantive quantitative or qualitative analysis. These data were used to assess the scope and depth of trade policy coverage in bilateral surveillance across countries and over time.
- For the entire Fund membership, we reviewed all trade policy-related SIPs, REDs, and other background papers prepared for Article IV consultations for 1996 through 2008. Papers were considered trade policy-related if they contained substantive quantitative or qualita-

¹ Including three territories (Hong Kong SAR, Aruba, and Netherlands Antilles) and four currency unions (CEMAC, the ECCU, the euro area, and WAEMU) that had Article IV consultations with the IMF during the evaluation period; excluding Montenegro and Somalia, which had no Article IV consultations during the evaluation period.

tive analysis of a trade policy issue. This gave us a total of 152 papers for the whole period. These data were used to assess the depth of trade policy coverage in bilateral surveillance.

- For regional surveillance, we reviewed staff reports and background papers for four currency unions (CEMAC, the ECCU, the euro area, and WAEMU) that had regular formal or informal consultations and for other regions (e.g., Central America and the Caribbean region) for which occasional Board reports were prepared during the evaluation period.
- For 15 case study countries, which were selected for a more in-depth examination of IMF involvement in trade policy issues, we reviewed, in addition to staff reports and background papers, other documents related to Article IV consultations including internal briefing papers and memoranda, back-to-office reports, minutes of Board discussions, and public information notices and other press releases. The case study countries, which were drawn from a range of income levels and geographical regions, were: Bangladesh, Brazil, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Korea, Mozambique, Norway, Tanzania, Turkey, Ukraine, United States, and Vietnam. They were chosen to cover a diversity of experience in the trade policy dialogue with the IMF, ranging from minimal/shallow to extensive/deep engagement.

C. Program Documents

4. The evaluation examined program documents (including staff reports, internal briefing papers and back-to-office reports for staff missions, background papers, minutes of relevant Board discussions, and press releases) to assess the IMF's coverage of trade policy issues, including trade conditionality, in Fund-supported programs. This evidence was drawn from the following (overlapping) samples:

- For the entire Fund membership, we reviewed all program requests (comprising letters of intent, memoranda of economic and financial policies (MEFPs), and associated staff reports) from 1996 through 2007.² Altogether a total of 226 programs was considered (including 88 Stand-By Arrangements, 19 Extended Arrangements, 113 ESAF/PRGF arrangements, and 6 Policy Support Instruments) for 93 coun-

² Programs that began before 1996 were not included. For multi-year ESAF/PRGF programs, only the first-year request was reviewed.

tries. Each program request was reviewed for the inclusion of conditionality (in the form of prior actions, structural performance criteria, or structural benchmarks) in 11 trade policy areas: tariffs, nontariff barriers, export restrictions, antidumping/countervailing measures, export subsidies, state trading monopolies, customs administration, trade in services, PTAs, WTO, and trade liberalization in general. To supplement this information, we used PDR's Monitoring of Fund Arrangements (MONA) database to identify trade conditions that were added after the initial request for all the programs in our sample. Taken together, these data were used to assess the incidence and scope of trade conditionality during the evaluation period.

- For 12 case study countries, we reviewed all program documents starting from 1996 (or earlier in some cases) through 2008. The case study countries were Bangladesh, Brazil, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Korea, Mozambique, Tanzania, Turkey, Ukraine, and Vietnam. The documents included staff reports, letters of intent, MEFPs, internal briefing papers and memoranda, back-to-office reports, ex post assessments, minutes of Board discussions, and press releases. The case study countries were chosen to cover varied experiences and outcomes, ranging from minimal to substantial trade conditionality.

D. Other Documents

5. Other IMF outputs used in this evaluation include: FSAP reports, IMF working papers, IMF publications (including the *WEO* and *REOs*), management speeches, and internal memoranda and notes on trade policy issues.

6. The evaluation also used various external documents, including reports by the WTO Secretariat, WTO TPRs, minutes of relevant WTO meetings, World Bank reports (including the 2004 evaluation of World Bank support for trade), academic papers, and media reports drawn from Factiva.

E. Interviews

7. As part of the evaluation, we interviewed 79 current and former IMF staff and held five focus group meetings with 26 participants from the A14–B4 level staff. We also interviewed current and former officials from 21 countries and staff of five international and regional institutions, and representatives from six civil society organizations.

Table AI.1. Data Sources Used in the Evaluation

	Surveillance Documents				Program Documents					
	Board Papers and Minutes	Staff reports for 1996, 2000, and 2006	SIPs	All Article IV documents, 1996–2007	Initial request documents plus MONA data	All program-related documents	Other Fund Documents ¹	External Documents ²	Interviews	Survey
Evaluation report	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Background documents										
“The Legal Mandate”	X								X	
“Cooperation Between the IMF and the WTO”	X						X	X	X	
“Guiding the IMF’s Involvement in International Trade Policy”	X						X		X	
“IMF Involvement in Trade Policy Issues in Low-Income Countries: Seven Case Studies”				X		X		X	X	
“Trade Conditionality in IMF-Supported Programs in Emerging Market Countries: Five Case Studies”				X		X	X	X	X	
“IMF Surveillance of Trade Policies: General Observations and Case Studies of Advanced Countries”		X	X	X			X		X	
Background papers										
“Preferential Trade Agreements in IMF Economic Work 1996–2007: An Assessment” (de Melo)	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	
“The IMF’s Trade Restrictiveness Index” (Krishna)	X						X	X	X	
“What Determines IMF Involvement in Trade Policy Issues?” (Yang and Yoon)		X			X		X			
“Re-evaluating the Effectiveness of Trade Conditions in Fund-Supported Programs” (Yoon)					X					
“Trade in Financial Services: Has the IMF Been Involved Constructively?” (Stern)	X	X	X	X			X	X		

¹ Including FSAP reports, IMF working papers, IMF publications (including the *WEO* and *REOs*), management speeches, and internal memoranda and notes on trade policy issues.

² Including reports by the WTO Secretariat, WTO TPRs, minutes of relevant WTO meetings, World Bank reports (including the 2004 evaluation of World Bank support for trade), academic papers, and media reports drawn from Factiva.