

A Report of the Conference on
'Trade, Development and Poverty Linkages: Lessons and Future Directions'
June 23, 2009, Country Inn Jaipur, India

Introduction

CUTS International organised a conference, designed as the final event of the project titled 'Trade, Development & Poverty Reduction Linkages' (*popularly known as TDP*) on June 23rd, 2009 in Jaipur India. This event reviewed and discussed the project's achievements and non-achievements and framed a way forward, focusing on research outputs project countries.

As a backdrop to the project, under its programme area on developmental issues, CUTS Centre for International Trade, Economics & Environment (www.cuts-citee.org) has implemented a multi-country project on the dynamic relationship between international trade and poverty reduction at the national as well as international levels. The project (<http://www.cuts-citee.org/tdp/index.htm>) analyses the linkages among trade, development and poverty reduction over a period of four years (January 2005 to December 2008) and was implemented with the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MINBUZA), The Netherlands and the Department for International Development (DFID), UK. It targeted a set of 13 developing and 2 developed countries for preparing background papers and sectoral case studies, hailing from the Sub Saharan Africa (Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia), South Asia (Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka) and South-East Asia (China, Cambodia and Vietnam) and Europe (UK and the Netherlands). The underlying objective of the project has been to study country experiences and the associated similarities and dissimilarities with a view to deriving policy lessons.

This event, as aimed, came out with a set of strategic messages and recommendations on trade-development-poverty linkages to shape the future debate on this subject. In addition, certain systemic issues that were dealt with during project implementation by partners were also addressed for more successful partnership and effective outcomes in the future. The project evaluator, S. V Divvaakar, Managing Director, Ace Global Private Limited, also presented the synthesis of both the evaluation reports of the TDP project, independently undertaken by Ace Global and DFID/MINBUZA. It was also useful *per se* for internal reflection and learnings for all the project partners.

Participants

Apart from most of the country partners (based on partnership with 19 organisations covered from 15 countries), the conference was well attended by more than 30 participants who included representatives of several civil society organisations in South Asia and Africa. Prominent participants in the event among others were Anwarul Hoda, former Member, Planning Commission, Government of India, Datuk M. Supperamian, Advisor WTO/FTA Negotiations, Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers, S. Chakravarthy, Adviser/Consultant on Competition Policy and Law, M A Razzaque, Economic Adviser Economic Affairs Division, Commonwealth Secretariat, UK etc.

INAUGURAL PANEL DISCUSSION

“Two Decades of Trade Liberalisation: The Links with Development and Poverty Reduction”

Executive Summary

The purpose of this session was to set the stage with the panellists giving their opinions on the linkages between trade, development and poverty. Each panellist was from a different country/region, and thus provided unique perspectives on the discussion. The main issues discussed were the political, social, physical and economic conditions necessary in developing countries for poverty to be effectively reduced through trade and growth. The views of most of the panellists converged on the point that the linkages between trade, development and poverty cannot be generalised, because conditions vary from country to country. The role of the WTO in fostering the linkage between these issues was also discussed by one of the panellists. The importance of the roles of CSOs in making stakeholders aware of the issues was also stressed. With reference to the TDP Project, better coordination between the project partners was emphasised in order to achieve optimal output. The discussion was concluded with a recommendation that communication is important to keep the momentum going in the long projects like TDP so that the partners do not fall out of touch and thus, potentially lose sight of the goals of the project.

Proceedings

Pradeep S. Mehta, Secretary General, CUTS International was the moderator of the panel. With his welcoming remarks, Mehta gave an introduction and presented key findings of the project (http://www.cuts-citee.org/ppt/Trade_Development_and_Poverty_Linkages-Lessons_and_Future_Directions.ppt). While emphasising a key finding of the project that a unique trade development policy linkage does not exist; it depends on country specific conditions, the stage was set for the panellists and they were invited to look at the following four questions for discussion.

- 1. Can trade at all significantly affect poverty and how?*
- 2. How well can the experiences of TDP linkages in developing countries be generalised?*
- 3. Is the nature of policies/institutions crucial to the realisation of these linkages? Why and why not?*
- 4. Given the current Doha round of experience, can WTO foster this linkage/synergy and how?*

Anwar-ul-Hoda, Former Member, Planning Commission, Government of India, was the first panellist and began the session by saying that for a country to grow in economic terms, it needs a stable social and political forum. He said that if a country lacks basic rule of law there will not be much progress because entrepreneurs want security of property and wealth. He said there is a need for good physical infrastructure, power, good transport

and utilities linking villages to cities. He quoted China as an example that has efficient manufacturing because it has developed world class infrastructure.

Hoda highlighted that for the country to prosper it is equally important for people to have an access to health and education. He mentioned that India has skill deficit that it needs to overcome. He went on to say that once a country has stability, physical and social infrastructure, it needs financial infrastructure - thereby highlighted the role of microfinance provision in rural/semi-urban areas. He also talked about the importance of investment policy especially in the services sector. He pointed out that studies have shown that trade openness in the services sector has led to development. He highlighted the need for flanking policies and that trade liberalisation needs to be done in stages.

He acknowledged that economic growth does not always leads to reduction in poverty, but there is an indirect effect. He pointed out to modern advanced industries that are highly mechanised and hire hardly any labour, reiterating the fact that trade openness will not always decrease poverty. He stressed the importance of providing people with livelihoods through schemes such as housing schemes and programs for small-scale entrepreneurs. He concluded by saying that trade and growth are quite interrelated, but growth does not always reduce poverty. Poverty needs hand holding by government and other organisations because growth will not directly decrease it.

M. Supperamaniam, Adviser to the Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers, was the second panellist and opened with the question 'Can trade be the engine of growth?' He stressed the importance of flanking policies and agreed with Hoda that if the country has no infrastructure, and it starts to liberalise, it will not see desired results. He said trade is pro-poor and pro-growth but empirical evidence has shown mixed results. He questioned whether the international trading environment has been favourable for developing countries to achieve their poverty reduction goals. He opined that on a gradual basis these countries have engaged unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally, but on the whole only a few have benefited. Even the countries that benefited, it is unclear whether the benefits from trade has trickled down to the poor. He said there was a need for safety nets with a view to protect the vulnerable sectors. He went on to say that WTO rules are biased towards developed countries, and that developing countries have not played/been allowed to play an influential role in the functioning of the WTO due to various reasons. He then said that trade policies that are pro-poor have not been effective because the poor have not been represented and there has not been extensive stakeholder consultation. He emphasised the importance of the role played by CSOs and NGOs. He concluded that trade openness is necessary, but with a progressive approach. He stressed the need for a regulatory framework to be in place in order to reduce adjustment costs.

Posh Raj Pandey, President, South Asia Watch on Trade, Economics and Environment (SAWTEE) in Nepal, was the third panellist. He said it was difficult to pinpoint the linkages between trade and poverty because trade was more market-based, whereas poverty has a more distributive aspect. Nevertheless, he highlighted the following four ways in which trade can affect poverty:

- Price of tradables can be reduced and thus these tradables can be more affordable for the poor, thereby improving their access to new products
- Trade can change the relative price of factors, for example, it can increase wages, which can help poverty alleviation
- Trade can increase government revenue which can result in higher government allocation to social services and programs for the poor
- Trade can lead to changing incentives for investment and innovation – increasing physical as well as human capital
- However, trade could lead to vulnerability of certain groups

He also said that the ultimate outcome of trade liberalisation can depend on many things, such as distribution of productive assets among different actors, the process of trade reforms and how the poor are defined. He said that least developing countries (LDCs) may not be able to take full advantage of trade liberalisation because they have not been able to shift from traditional sectors into dynamic sectors and they also have large trade deficits. He emphasised the need for phased trade liberalisation with a considerable amount of social safety nets in place, to reach the goal of lower poverty.

Mukasa Misusera, Director of Programmes of the Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations in Uganda was the last panellist. He began with the issue of gender, which is coming to the fore when trade liberalisation is taken into account. He cited an example saying that married women in Uganda are discriminated against, and therefore women may not gain as much as men from trade liberalisation. He also pointed out that another pertinent aspect of effect of trade on the poor, he asked, who is representing the poor? Because poor do not have the knowledge as to how trade policies affect them, they will have no say in the decision-making process. They need representation. He also emphasised the issue of governance especially with respect to what the political situation is in the country. He said dumping in Africa (especially by Asia) was an issue because local industries were being harmed.

Pradeep S. Mehta, following a floor discussion, summed up the session and concluded with the thought that CSOs do play an important role, but it is more important for them to understand the issues properly - talk on the basis of knowledge garnered rather than on the basis of rhetoric.

SESSION 1

Regional Case Presentation: Trade Openness –The Missing Links

Introduction

The session reviewed research component of the project on ‘*Linkages between Trade, Development and Poverty Reduction*’ with a view to identify missing links between TDP and identify key messages emanating from the project. The session mainly touched upon regional experiences and important lessons learnt through the trade liberalisation process.

The discussions provided remarks and suggestions on the regional findings and appreciated the country-specific design for the way forward.

Given the forward looking mode of the conference, the session moderator **Dr. Siddhartha Mitra**, Director (Research), CUTS & Head, CUTS-CITEE, India, opened the session with a question that “*Does or has greater openness of world economy made a difference on growth rate and poverty reduction?*”. Apart from TDP linkages of the country and its sectoral cases, he stressed that an element of income mobility needs to be paid attention. Income mobility is fast with trade openness, as terms of trade vis-à-vis different sectors change very fast with trade openness. So even if progress in poverty reduction is sensed in one sector, a lot of people plunged into below poverty line in other. In nutshell, he mentioned that a lot of churning is possible in the process to the extent that aggregate level of poverty remain constant. With this note, Mitra called upon the speakers for presentation.

1. Africa Perspective

The first case presentation on linkages between TDP from *the African perspective* (Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia) was presented by **Miriam Omolo**, Trade Programme Officer at the Institute of Economic Affairs in Kenya and **Kibre Moges**, Senior Researcher, Ethiopian Economic and Policy Research Institute, Ethiopia was the Discussant. (http://www.cuts-citee.org/ppt/Trade_Openness_and_Poverty_The_Missing_Link.ppt)

Proceedings

Miriam Omolo proceeded by defining the concept of trade openness in terms of moving away from inward looking trade strategies to towards those policies that facilitate integration to global economy. She stated that it includes the removal of trade barriers like tariff and non-tariff barriers. Trade openness means free market access for foreign goods and services which is facilitated by WTO and other free trade agreements such as the current EPAs being negotiated between the EU and African countries. She mentioned that the overall objective of trade is to increase individual welfare of those involved in trade. Poverty on the other hand is the inability of one to meet both food and non-food requirements and leaving on a less than 1 US dollar a day.

Omolo goes on that trade liberalisation in Africa resulted in both gainers and losers. Further, she referred to UNCTAD report (2004) to substantiate the point that trade and development linkages were far from being uniform and often new issues come up which are so diverse that the general relationship between trade and development has remained a subject of regular empirical scrutiny. She said, most of the African countries underwent economic and trade liberalisation through three phases: Import substitution industrialisation, Structural adjustment which was facilitated by the IMF and World Bank in the early 90's in most African countries and through reciprocal liberalisation in the WTO, and thirdly through regional and bilateral agreements.

Nonetheless, she mentioned that, there is a strong debate whether trade liberalisation has led to sustained economic growth in most of these African countries. The most basic

argument has been that countries have not achieved international competitiveness especially with agricultural products being their main exports, for instance, countries like Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Zambia have not moved up in value chain. Thus, evidence is yet to be showcased in African perspective to conclude that trade liberalisation has resulted in poverty reduction.

Omolo then identified the following missing links, which included among others:

- Wrong presumptions because, as the project finds out, trade liberalisation does not guarantee equitable distribution of wealth.
- Trade liberalisation as a panacea for development-trade is a component of development;
- Export diversification and intensification
- Concentration of export promotion with little focus on productivity growth through learning, knowledge, accumulation and innovation of trade.
- Innovation was also one strong missing link, which should be emphasis.

Remarks

The key remarks were presented by ***Kibre Moges***, senior researcher, Ethiopian Economic and Policy Research Institute who questioned the methodology of the existing work of Dollar & Kray, one of the most criticised work on this issue. He goes on that trade is linked to employment, exchange rate, wages but it does not show that trade is responsible for poverty reduction. He further reasoned that even if other works argue that there is a correlation between trade and poverty, trade liberalisation is a strategy for development and not a cure for sustainable development. He further asserted that method of comparative advantage is based on number of assumptions and a country has to go through number of economic reforms before achieving pro-poor trade, such as addressing supply side constraints. The TDP project should have taken a different approach by differentiating countries by their stages of development other than using sectors. One important factor that has not been considered in the presentation is of aid. He maintained that as trade liberalisation was initiated by donors, hence it lacks ownership. There are short-lived effects of aid, which after a small period fizzle out and growth begins to decline. The missing link of 'infrastructure' is applicable to whole country rather than functioning of trade alone. It was further maintained that it is not that trade is not important but it needs to be streamlined in specific national trade policy and development strategies. Thus, priority settings have to be specific.

2. South Asian Perspective

The second case presentation on linkages between TDP from *the South Asian perspective* (Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka from South Asia) was presented by ***Dr. Selim Raihan***, Executive Director, South Asia Network on Economic Modeling, Bangladesh, and ***M Suppermaniam***, Advisor, Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers,

Malaysia was the Discussant. (http://www.cuts-citee.org/ppt/Trade_Development_and_Poverty_Linkages-Experience_from_South_Asia.ppt)

Proceedings

Selim Raihan started off his presentation by an historical overview of policies in the region. He stated that a trade liberalisation promised growth and poverty reduction in developing countries including South Asia, however, trade and development experiences amongst these countries have been diverse and far from being similar. He mentioned that there are number of theoretical linkages regarding trade and poverty and these are looked at in terms of trade-growth, trade-income distribution and trade-poverty, while trade liberalisation and growth draws most attention. Raihan referred to inconclusive theoretical arguments in terms of static gains and dynamic gains from trade arguments, while the new growth theories were pronounced ambiguous in bringing out the linkages between trade and poverty reduction.

Raihan further mentioned that the TDP empirical evidence gathered from thirteen countries was inconclusive and the powerful evidence found was credible as identifying countries as open or closed in consistent manner is often difficult and direct relationship between trade and poverty is complex. He mentioned that trade liberalisation was a part of the IMF and WB economic reform policies hence it is difficult to deduce the benefits of trade liberalisation. These reforms led to a decline in QRs, rationalisation and diminution of import tariffs, relaxation of foreign exchange controls, and privatisation of State-owned enterprises (SOEs).

Speaking about the reform experiences in the South Asian project countries in terms of their tariff profiles at the time of undertaking reforms and in the post reform period, he showed that Bangladesh, India and Pakistan had the highest average tariffs immediately before considering liberalisation. Nepal and Sri Lanka were relatively open during the late 1980s and their tariffs declines during the early 2000s. In 2001, Bangladesh and India were amongst the most closed economies, nevertheless their annual average growth for the period 1995-2002 had been higher than most of the developing countries. He further discussed the relationship between changes in poverty and changes in income in the TDP project countries for the period 1990-2000 where he suggested that India had the highest rate of poverty reduction in the region. On the other hand, despite some modest growth, poverty situation deteriorated Pakistan. During the same time, Nepal is the other Asian country to demonstrate impressive pro-poor growth. By contrast, despite having comparable growth rates, poverty reduction experiences of Bangladesh and India have been remarkably different.

The TDP sectoral case findings concluded the importance of ownership of the policy regime other than those imposed by donors. It is important that export response to liberalisation should also assess whether removing of anti-exports bias was adequate. The success of trade liberalisation should not only imply mere tariff cuts but more fundamental in nature such as addressing supply side constraints of high export delivery time, poor physical infrastructure, lack of technology upgrade and trade barriers, as trade

reforms do not build supply side capacity automatically. He went to suggest that effective government policies for export promotion benefit selects sectors while some sectors lose out despite measures. Therefore, efforts should be put to mitigate the adjustments costs like loss of jobs, income for many households. It is also important that policy space is granted to the LDCs and making use of it by the developing countries.

In his concluding remarks, Raihan mentioned that trade policy is a fundamental component of development strategies. A wide deviations from the general liberalisation and economic prosperity in the TDP country cases show the need for learning from others' experiences but blind replication may not work and he lastly concluded that development friendly international trade regime is important in promoting trade for development and poverty linkages in poor countries.

Remarks

M Suppermaniam, Advisor, Federation of Malaysian Manufacturers, Malaysia presented the remarks, who emphasised that ownership of poverty reduction strategies domestically are essential if trade liberalisation has to contribute to poverty reduction. Further, countries should be clear in their trade policy objectives and development strategy. He mentioned that trade policy should be part of the development agenda of a specific country and that there should be coherence among relevant ministries and stakeholders who should be involved in policy planning, implementation and evaluation. He also highlighted the point that trade liberalisation should not only be about tariff reduction but should be accompanied by other reforms such as trade facilitation and measures to address supply side constraints.

3. South-East Asian Perspective

The South East Asia presentation was made by **Dr. Niru Yadav**, Senior Research Associate of CUTS International *on the behalf of Dr. Seiha Neou*, Senior Researcher at the Economic Institute of Cambodia. (http://www.cuts-citee.org/ppt/Trade_and_Poverty_Experiences_from_Cambodia.ppt) and **Alice Pham** of CUTS Resource Centre in Hanoi was the discussant.

Proceedings

The presentation looked at three sectors namely the Agriculture, Tourism and the Garment Sectors. The garment industry was seen to have contributed to poverty reduction as it increased exports in the sector, had high labour standard compliance (key linkage between trade and poverty) and generated direct incomes, while employing more than 320 000 workers. Niru said that the industry also employed about 1 million people indirectly and contributed to the emergence of other businesses such as food, housing and transport.

With respect to the tourism sector, Siemreap province is the most popular tourist site in Cambodia, despite also being one of the poorest provinces. However, income and employment for tourist activities mostly come from Siemreap town. Niru pointed out that the tourism sector has had few links to directly reducing poverty mostly because there is

a lack of infrastructure that connects towns to rural areas and there is a huge lack of human resources (tourism service operators, skilled guides etc.).

Agriculture is the most important sector in Cambodia as 60-70 percent of Cambodians are farmers. She said that agricultural export in Cambodia represents about 20 percent of total goods export, even though it is mostly done through informal channels. The sector has experienced very modest growth rates and has the largest share of poor population. A few reasons were given for this:

- A lack of marketing and distribution channels which allowed for a large gap in farm-gate and consumer prices (external traders manipulating prices), leaving farmers with low incomes.
- Farmers lack knowledge on procedure/standards of export products
- Lack of adequate infrastructure and irrigation systems

The presenter drew the linkage between trade and poverty. The country has experienced double-digit growth rates and also high trade growth (with employment mostly being generated in the textiles sector). However, she pointed out that although the country had high GDP and trade growth, these have not transmitted into poverty reduction at similar rates (poverty reduced at 1 percent per year – being 35 percent in 2004). She went on to explain that this might be because growth was mostly confined to the urban areas. To conclude, Niru highlighted some of the challenges Cambodia could face especially in light of the current global crisis:

- A decline in garment exports in 2009 because of a decrease in demand in its major markets, namely the US and the EU
- Decline in tourists in 2009
- Weakening investor sentiment as a result of the crisis, leading to a decline in FDI into garment and tourism industries in 2009

Niru also stressed the importance of promoting agricultural trade as most of the country's poor population is farmer community. The challenge in promoting this sector is that it is sensitive at the multilateral front with little progress made in terms of trade liberalisation. Thus, getting access to markets will prove difficult. She also said that building internal supply-side capacities by increasing production, value-added products and moving into agro-processing and market based agricultural systems will be another challenge.

Remarks

The remarks were done by ***Alice Pham*** of CUTS Resource Centre in Hanoi. She made a comparison of the differing effects of trade liberalisation on Cambodia and Vietnam. She said that poverty reduction in Vietnam was about 3.2 percent per year, as opposed to the 1 percent in Cambodia. She noted that both countries were dependent on agriculture, but this has not translated to higher poverty reduction in Cambodia possibly because of the issues of landlessness and 'land-snatching' in the country. She went on to say that infrastructure needs to be improved in Cambodia, because currently the poor are

disconnected from the urban market. She stressed the importance of flanking policies, saying that Vietnam has put effort into improving health and education. There has been widespread public/administration reform in Vietnam, but corruption in Cambodia has prevented this from happening. She said that in Vietnam, resources were put into addressing the vulnerability of the poor through programs such as budget management for farmers. There is a pro-poor private sector development strategy in Vietnam, where the private sector can improve conditions of the poor through programs such as microfinance. She concluded with the point that governance in Vietnam was the significant differentiating factor in the impact of liberalisation on the two countries.

SESSION 2

Impact Analysis - Project Outreach

1. Introduction

The afternoon session focused on the impact and outreach of the TDP projects drawing from the evaluation findings and country specific viewpoints on research, advocacy efforts (achievements), challenges and sustainability of the project outcomes. The representatives from various partner countries shared their perceptions on if and how the project has generated awareness among stakeholders and the impact of the project in influencing government action for policy change. S.V. Divvaakar, Managing Director, Ace Global Private Limited started the session with the evaluation findings focusing on achievements, project beneficiaries, limitations and shortcomings, along with recommendations for such future projects.

TDP project partners from various countries in South Asia (Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) South-East Asia (Cambodia, Vietnam) and Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia) presented their perspectives on the impact (in terms of outcomes) and outreach of the project outcome at the individual country (local) level. Gijsbert van Liemt, Independent consultant, Sweden touched upon various aspects of North-South and North-North linkages and reflected upon some critical issues that should be addressed by future TDP projects. The session concluded with a fruitful floor discussion on the need to encourage research and advocacy partners to work together and for southern country partners to increase horizontal interactions and information sharing to learn from one another not only during project implementation stage but also beyond project culmination.

2. Proceedings

S.V. Divvaakar started the session with a background on the activities and outputs of the project in terms of research materials, advocacy tools, meetings and conferences thereby highlighting the unprecedented magnitude and geographical coverage of the TDP project. (http://www.cuts-citee.org/ppt/Trade_Development_and_Poverty_Linkages-Lessons_and_Future_Directions-SV_Divvaakar.ppt). It was indicated that all activities were completed on time with no major over-runs, including multiple local outreach workshops, and generation of unique and useful material offering valuable insights for policy formulation. The project also received significant exposure at international events

with adequate attendance. It was opined that while the production of international advocacy document with seven key messages were useful, there was a lack of contextualization of the messages implying an international direction of the project's advocacy rather than national. Limited dissemination in individual countries, particularly in engaging local/sector/ industry bodies outside the purview of trade ministry, lack of sustained engagement with policy makers outside events, limited partner interactions, feedback and donor engagement along with leniency in project management at headquarters were highlighted as some of the shortcomings of the project.

TDP has provided several project partners an exposure to trade related issues, furthered international visibility of CUTS international, generated spin-off projects on similar topics while facilitating partner access to CUTS network, research and advocacy material. In addition, material for policy makers and development agencies with valuable lessons on the absence of one to one linkages between trade and poverty reduction, the need for targeted resource allocations and focus on external factors like macroeconomic stability, trade facilitation, standards, etc were also deemed important for trade to generate pro-poor growth and facilitate poverty reduction.

Impact and contribution of the projects have been evidenced by pro-poor trade policies in National Development Strategies with a rise in CSO involvement in PRSPs formulation and resource allocation for trade. In addition, countries like Bangladesh and Vietnam have proceeded to enhance productive capacities in labour- intensive export-competitive sectors while others are working towards improving trade capacity development support and exploiting preferential market access opportunities.

Some of the recommendations based on lessons from the TDP project included undertaking flexible, shorter duration modules as the long lag between research outcomes and advocacy activities may reduce effectiveness of outreach, by rendering certain issues to be irrelevant with time. The need for reducing disconnects between project and local advocacy needs through customization of issues and engagement with a wider range of stakeholders was emphasised.

The session proceeded with country partners sharing their perceptions and impact (outcomes against objectives) of the TDP projects in their respective countries. The detailed country-wise notes are available at http://www.cuts-citee.org/Presentations-Event-TDP_23June2009.htm)

2.1 Bangladesh

A representative from the Department of Development Studies, University of Dhaka indicated that *Unnayan Shamannay*, the research and advocacy project partner conducted two perception surveys, one for each case study, and a series of training programs and national dialogues involving a range of stakeholders- CSOs, government officials, media, etc. Briefly touching upon the project outputs- background research materials and case studies on the RMG and telecommunications sectors, he went on to point out the TDP campaign kit, an easily understandable booklet titled 'Trade Made Easy' prepared in the local language for wide dissemination.

Training workshops were organised for journalists on trade issues, while a series of newspaper articles were prepared and published under the project. National dialogues and workshops organised as part of project outreach received considerable attention both in electronic and print media. Hence, the media has also been concretized to focus on trade policies which help achieve pro-poor growth and the institution has been consulted by the media regularly in the event of any policy debate on trade and development issues.

Unnayan Shamannay also worked closely with the Ministry of Finance, Commerce, Planning and line ministries while implementing the project. Dr. Rahman, former chair of the institute was able to influence public policies towards making them pro-poor through his participation in the consultative committee of the Ministry of Finance and other government bodies. Engagements of relevant policy makers in project outreach activities have facilitated them to take a fresh look into trade policy especially in the light of poverty reduction strategies. Therefore, the major achievement of the project has been in mainstreaming trade into the nation's development policy. The institution has been consulted in preparing the Export and Import Policy 2006-2009 and also consulted prior to budget preparation. Moreover, the study has also encouraged non-governmental activities to pro-labour welfare policies which have been influencing social safety net and food security related policy actions of the government.

However, certain factors like use of micro-level household and farm data has been overlooked by the study while impacts on the marginalised groups have not been undertaken. The Bangladeshi experience has shown a complex relationship between trade and poverty reduction with the need for improving productive capacities, removing supply-side bottle necks, undertaking institutional reforms along with putting adequate safety nets in place for the trade liberalization to be pro-poor.

2.2 India

A representative of *CUTS International* opined that unlike other partners, CUTS has played a dual role of in-country project implementation as well as management and implementation of the multi-country project by coordinating with 13 country partners and sensitising stakeholders across the board. Hence, it is difficult to identify clear-cut outcomes of the two roles separately. Moreover, parallel implementation of other trade and development related projects like GRANITE (Grassroots Reachout & Networking in India on Trade & Economics) and MINTDEV (Mainstreaming International Trade into National Development Strategy: A pilot project in Bangladesh and India) by CUTS has made it more difficult to tease out the individual impacts of these projects in influencing new developments in the national policy.

In terms of work in India, CUTS has tried to foster awareness and participation of the grassroots in national and international trade policy formulation through (combined impact of TDP, GRANITE & MINDEV) 7-8 local organisations with deep connections to the grassroots, which were in turn benefited by involvement in the mentioned projects. The empowerment of these local organisations has strengthened civil society's role in trade and development issues.

Sector specific recommendations derived from various trade and development related research (including case studies on Hand-knotted carpets and Oilseeds under the TDP project) undertaken by CUTS have been submitted to the Ministry of Commerce (MoC). As a result, MoC has commissioned three studies to CUTS to assess the trade and gender impact of the government's new policy initiatives. CUTS has made an important contribution towards increasing the development orientation of the ministry's foreign trade policy through its role in the India chapter of TDP

CUTS has been advocating with developed as well as advanced developing countries to offer preferential market access to poor / least developing countries. In this context, CUTS has also been advocating with the Indian government. The initiative was strengthened by TDP findings. Not only did CUTS advocate through media articles, but it also sent an advocacy letter to the MoC and made a presentation before the MoC in March 2007. The Government of India made an announcement to unilaterally provide preferential market access to most exports of 50 LDCs followed at the first India-Africa Forum summit on April 09, 2008 in New Delhi, India. This reflects to an extent the role of advocacy with the government.

2.3 Nepal:

A representative of *SAWTEE*, which was also the project research partner, presented views on research, advocacy and outreach (*Pro-Public* was the advocacy partner for Nepal TDP chapter) of the TDP projects in Nepal. Three research outputs including two case studies on the tea and garment sectors were published, while one launching meeting, two national policy dialogues, one roundtable discussion, one national workshop and five media workshops were organised. These events provided a platform for various stakeholders and contributed to the policy making process, by regular government representation, especially from the Ministries of Finance, Supplies and Foreign Affairs and the National Planning Commission. The efforts of SAWTEE and Pro Public along with likeminded organisations contributed to the underscoring of the linkages between trade and development by the Three-Year Interim Plan (a development plan for the period 2007-2010), by the Government of Nepal.

In addition, Dr. Yuba Raj Khatiwada, who undertook background research on "Linkage between Trade, Development and Poverty Reduction: A Study on Short-Term Impact of Trade Liberalization on Poverty in Nepal", has been appointed as the vice-chairman of the National Planning Commission, raising hope that the government consider the policy recommendations of the TDP project.

A campaign toolkit in the form of leaflets was also published in the local language for wider dissemination. A workshop on WTO and the agriculture sector facilitated awareness about WTO issues and the challenges and opportunities faced by the agriculture sector. This particular workshop was attended by district level farmer leaders wherein about 45 out of total 75 districts were represented.

Training workshops for media personnel on trade and development issues were conducted both in Kathmandu and outside the capital city. As a result of such trainings and workshops, there has been visible improvement in media coverage and increased public awareness of trade issues. An important outcome of the project is its positive contribution and influence towards the three-year interim plan 2007-2010.

2.4 Pakistan:

Representatives of the *Asian Institute of Trade and Development* (research partner) and *Sustainable Development Policy Institute* (advocacy partner) provided country perceptions on research and advocacy components of Pakistan TDP chapter respectively. Case studies were undertaken in two sectors-cutlery and telecommunications- which have been affected in opposite ways following trade liberalisation. The cutlery sector, which is a major source of employment, is dominated by small and medium enterprises and export growth has been stagnant following liberalisation due to increased Chinese cutlery imports. In addition the sector also lacked adequate investments, modernization and entrepreneur participation in trade fairs. On the other hand, the telecommunications sector has expanded with an increase in direct and indirect employment creation, as well as in making telecommunications services accessible and affordable to consumers from different income groups.

The background studies conducted in Pakistan helped to make the advocacy campaign more poor friendly. In terms of advocacy and outreach, awareness raising consultative seminar on TDP, dialogues with stakeholders to explore possible ways for focused efforts to promote TDP objectives and dialogues to share and discuss country background paper were undertaken. Mass awareness raisings were held to share lessons with international collaborators and policy options discussed to pursue TDP activities in the future. National workshops, training of media personnel, publication of newspaper articles and dissemination of a campaign kit- TDP advocacy document was also undertaken.

Such outreach activities have facilitated towards mainstreaming development issues in Pakistan's trade policies, in addition to generating awareness among stakeholders regarding the relationship of trade and development. Training of media personnel has helped to build a pool of well informed journalists for active advocacy through media while this has also inspired two journalists to pursue further studies with trade specialization.

Owing to advocacy and close working relationship with Ministry of Commerce, the MoC has renamed and reframed the Foreign Trade Institute of Pakistan as Pakistan Institute of Trade and Development. A MoU was also signed with Pakistan Institute of Trade and Development on "Trade and Development Linkages". In 2009 the MoC approached SDPI to develop the country's trade policy. In addition, this has also prompted changes in labour policy to make it more development friendly while marginalised groups have been sensitized about their rights and roles.

There were certain challenges with regards to gathering all stakeholders in the same time and keeping them engaged and interested for a prolonged period of time.

2.5 Sri Lanka:

Representatives of the *Institute of Policies Studies* (research partner) and *Law & Society Trust* (advocacy partner) provided country perceptions on research and advocacy components of Sri Lanka TDP chapter respectively. A background paper on trade and poverty linkages at the macro level and two case studies on the garment and textile sectors were undertaken by the IPS and despite the institute's strong links with the trade policy formulating bodies of the government, the outcome of the project was not very successful in influencing policy debate. Such limited impact in generating much interest at the policymaking level was further echoed by the advocacy partner citing the timing of project activities coinciding with the drastic deterioration of the ceasefire between the government and the LTTE.

Issues related to conflict took precedence over economic and social issues, nevertheless, four national dialogues and two provincial awareness raising workshops were carried out. While the national dialogue provided a much needed space for sharing knowledge on trade and related issues during a time when the government was engrossed with the conflict rather than promoting trade. Such activities have facilitated congregation of the public and private sector, media and civil society, however, a senior government official in the capacity of the Director General of the Department of Commerce where all trade related decision making occurs, were present only during the 2008 national dialogue.

In addition, a campaign kit and twelve newspaper articles were also published. The campaign kit was published in three languages while some of the articles have also been translated in local languages. It was also observed that there was a lack of interest among the newspaper editors to publish articles with analytical arguments on trade and related issues due to the content being 'too heavy' for the general public. Nevertheless, the campaign kit, which was prepared to introduce the common man to trade and related issues, has been successful in generating awareness.

South-East Asia

2.6 Cambodia

A representative from the *Economic Institute of Cambodia* (EIC), the project partner of Cambodia TDP chapter presented views on the advocacy and outreach of the project. Three National Dialogues were organised with participants from the National Assembly and the Senate, government, donors, private sectors, NGOs and academia. The topic and the matters discussed in the conference were widely disseminated through local media. Several articles related to the project have been published in English as well as in the local languages in various print media with the objective of providing in depth analysis and generating further knowledge among readers on issues discussed in the national dialogues.

In addition to the large national dialogue, quarterly meetings with the Trade and Economic Development Network (TEDN) of the NGO Forum on Cambodia were also held to discuss issues related to trade and economic development policy as well as implementation. Regular consultations and information sharing with interest groups also

took place while parliamentarians usually requested for documents related to trade and sought opinion and ideas on how to make trade pro-poor from researchers involved with the TDP project before approving any law related to trade.

While EIC has maintained close consultation with researchers and development practitioners as well as with individual organizations such as World Fish Centre, the NGO Forum on Cambodia, Fishery Action Coalition Team (FACT), etc. NGOs, donors and journalists often request EIC researchers for interviews and also seek their views on trade, development and poverty issues.

Campaign kits and other publications with simplified information on the linkages of trade, development and poverty have been widely used as reference among students and other interested individuals. In addition to thousands of copies of the campaign kit produced under the TDP project, there was a request by the TEDN to produce an additional 2500 copies of the kit in the local language for wider distribution among students, community leaders, NGOs, CSOs and other parties. As a result it generated discussion and interest on how trade policy is made and conducted, and how this affects people's livelihoods.

2.7 Vietnam

A representative of the *Centre for Development and Integration* presented views on the impact and outreach of the TDP project in Vietnam. She mentioned that the national dialogues and workshops also addressed issues related to aid for trade, competition policy and regulation in addition to trade, development and poverty issues. Such topics received positive responses and generated interest among young researchers in the forums.

As Vietnam joined the WTO as a full member in November of 2006, there was a lot of eagerness to know about these issues from a range of stakeholders. The centre also engaged parliamentary members, individuals from the ministry of trade and commerce, ministry of labour, donors and representatives from the foot-ware sector in their advisory group.

However, the role of a CSO in advocacy effort is limited due to the lack of in depth knowledge on trade issues. While the centre itself has been working on poverty issues for the last ten years, moving into the trade dimension has been a challenge on one hand, while linking with other INGOs have been difficult on the other, due to their largely anti-WTO stance. Moreover, the media is also reluctant to take up issues related to the poor and instead prefer to report on attractive commercial subjects.

An important outcome of the project is in influencing labour policies, wherein the ministry of labour has introduced social security schemes for down sized sector workers, along with incentive policies for enterprises. In addition there have been initiatives to enforce high labour standards compatible with WTO rules. A training workshop on competition and regulation issues was also undertaken while the advisory policy group is still active and involved in providing useful debates.

East Asia

2.8 China

On the behalf of the **National Economic Research Institute**, a note from NERI was read out to communicate perceptions and impact of the project in China. In addition to research outputs in the form of a background paper and two case studies in the southern part of China on the agricultural and electronic appliances sectors, national dialogues and seminars at various stages of the project were also organised. Newspaper articles and project related articles on relevant journals were also published. For example, one article entitled Gender Wage Gap in Urban China During the First Upsurge of Trade Liberalization was published on *International Trade Journal*, Vol. 6, 2007

Africa

2.9 Kenya

A representative from the *Institute of Economic Affairs*, the advocacy partner of the TDP project, presented views on the challenges as well as the impact of the project in Kenya. The first national dialogue was developed after the first research output to identify the winners and losers from trade liberalisation. Then, case studies on the advantaged sector- telecommunications and the disadvantaged sector- cotton were carried out via perception surveys. Given the scope of the research, it was difficult to assess the extent of the net effect of liberalisation.

The legislators from cotton growing areas were particularly interested in the perception survey on cotton. A cotton policy brief was prepared and presented at the annual legislative conference, which highlighted the required legislative action and also provided input into the Act that created the new Cotton Board. The report, furthermore, culminated in a forum organized by Action Aid Kenya, which facilitated a meeting between cotton stakeholders and the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Trade and Industry where they stated their grievances and the government in return communicated the initiatives they had put in place to revive cotton sub-sector and the financing opportunities available.

Due to the media's lack of understanding on trade issues, joint workshops of media personnel and government officials were not effective. Hence, separate training sessions were held for the media. However, the journalists were interested in only certain issues that would make news while other pertinent but commercially unattractive issues were not given attention.

Nevertheless, as a result of the project, the media has become more aware of issues relating to trade, development and poverty and there is currently a network of journalists who are regularly updated on trade issues by IEA for a wider reach to the public.

The national dialogue of the first year suffered from little research to use for advocacy throughout the project period given that the research partners were only paid to conduct research in the first year. The advocacy partner had to commission short studies for advocacy in the third and fourth years. Hence, this lack of information beyond the TDP research output resulted in a spin-off project on safeguard measures in the dairy and sugar

sectors. The results indicated that safeguard measures are imposed for political reasons rather than for development reasons. In order to carry out further research on the area, a need to develop a working group in safeguard measures and other trade remedies were also observed.

One of the major outcomes of the project was establishment of close contact with legislator and influence in development of its strategic plan 2008-2013. In addition, TDP has become a strong pillar within the trade program in the institute. While the ministry of trade and planning usually approaches the institution of trade related consultation, they are more interested in issues of tariff binding and negotiations, particularly issues of policy space rather than the impact of tariffs on long term poverty reduction.

2.10 Tanzania

On the behalf of the *Economic and Social Research Foundation*, the TDP country partner, a note on perceptions and impact of the project in Tanzania was presented. The research component of the project resulted in research papers- (i) Macroeconomic Policies, Growth and Poverty Reduction (ii) Linking production and marketing chain using sesame in Tanzania as a model: Policy challenges, and case studies on the cotton and textile sector, fisheries sub-sector and the agricultural sector.

The advocacy component resulted in two National Dialogue workshops with wide stakeholder participation and one small group meeting targeted to small farmers. 500 copies of the advocacy campaign kit was published and distributed in English with additional copies in the local language. The kit has helped generate awareness on how trade can be used as a tool to fight against poverty and also improve understanding of the relationship between trade, development and poverty.

Workshop participants, particularly government officials benefited through useful knowledge facilitating them to formulate policy. The same knowledge and skills have improved their capacity necessary for Economic Management, negotiation and articulation of issues related to Trade, Development and Poverty.

Between 2005 and 2009 (during the TDP implementation period) a number of changes were made in the Tanzania's trade policies. Although a set of partly interlinked factors may influence a country's policy, it is believed the TDP project partly provided inputs and new insights to the Tanzanian trade policy given that some of the trade policy makers were active participants at the national TDP workshops.

The Tanzanian research identified the need for Tanzanian people to increase their business acumen but also pointed out some of the challenges such as lack of capital to start business; lack of entrepreneurship culture in the country, small domestic market in terms of level of income of the majority of people, poor infrastructure leading to high transaction costs and hence less profit; and lack of information on supply and demand for the goods being produced.

2.11 Uganda

A representative from the *Consumer Education Trust of Uganda*, the advocacy partner of the TDP project presented views on the challenges as well as the impact of the project in Uganda. It was opined that in general the project was deemed successful with the benefits accruing to a wide range of stakeholders such as the executive, legislature, judiciary, regulators, business associations, farmers (and farmer organization), development partners, civil society and ordinary consumers.

The research outputs have been widely used and quoted by different stakeholders from both private and public institutions, while recommendations from the study have facilitated policy advocacy and worked as a catalyst for further research on national development strategies. The research outputs have also facilitated the advocacy process with an evidence based approach. The national dialogues and in country regional dialogues have provided a platform for stakeholders to discuss trade and development related issues. The dialogue outputs have been used to petition the Dairy Development Authority and Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries on farmer and consumer concerns related to quality of agro farm inputs and quality and safety of dairy products.

The advocacy campaign kit has also been widely circulated and appreciated by various stakeholders. While issues in the kit were reflected in the 2009-10 national budget's five priority focus on agriculture; human resource – education; health; energy – infrastructure; and peace, security and governance, the project does not claim that this was solely because of the kit.

Networking with both the private and public sectors and with other like-minded organisations on trade, development and poverty issues have increased as a result of the TDP project. The project has also played a role in partner institutional/organizational development and capacities (human, infrastructure, planning and operational).

However, challenges have existed in terms of low awareness of the linkages and appreciation of the ability of the resource poor to contribute to trade and socio-economic development. In addition, there have been limited resources to implement the increasing demand of the project spread. Another major challenge brought out by the Uganda presentation was that although government bodies were active participants in the advocacy workshops, the nodal Ministries concerned with trade were merely interested in messages pertaining to retention of domestic policy flexibility in the EPA negotiations on tariff reductions but not equally concerned of the potential impacts such liberalisation would have on the welfare of the poor in agriculture and manufacturing sectors.

2.12 Zambia

A representative from the *CUTS Africa resource centre* in Zambia presented views on the impact and outreach of the TDP project in Zambia. The research outcomes, particularly case studies on cotton and textiles, prepared in the form of tool kits have

informed various stakeholders especially producers and rural communities. Some of the stakeholders identified for the consultations during implementation of the research included PELUM Association, National Farmers Union, Zambia Export Growers Association, Agri-business forum, and ministry of agriculture, Zambia Consumers Association, National Trade Network, Partners of Oxfam, Zambia Trade Enhancement, Ministry of Trade and Ministry of Agriculture. The consultation process also provided as capacity building for these institutions, which further wanted to know more about the linkages.

National and provincial dialogues that were carried out in different locations in Zambia provided a common platform for producers, exporters, government bodies, media, private sector and civil society organisation to share information and discuss trade policies which can address poverty reduction. These foras further led to producer dialoguing policy makers to change their policies. For example, Spar, a local supermarket, was persuaded by small farmers after the workshop in Livingstone to purchase vegetables from them rather than import from South Africa.

The Zambian presentation pointed out that the outcomes of the study were not representative since it was limited to certain parts of the country and no mechanisms were set up to identify gaps and undertake further follow-ups or research on the case studies beyond the first year of the project research. In addition, the case studies undertaken focussed only on agro-processing and textiles and thus concentrated on processors and not producers of the raw materials; hence, the positive assessment on productivity and turnover highlighted by the research might not apply to small-scale producers.

Furthermore, as trade liberalisation was implemented alongside economic liberalisation it was difficult for the TDP study to isolate the effects of trade liberalisation from those of economic liberalisation; this affected the reliability of the advocacy messages of the project on the TDP linkages. Finally, inadequate funds were also a major challenge with regards to making follow-up meetings in provinces where the project was introduced.

2.13 Perspectives on North-South and North-North Linkages

Gijsbert van Liemt, independent consultant from Sweden provided views on some crucial issues that future TDP studies could undertake. He pointed out that most of the issues discussed are universal, varying by different degrees across nations. He opined that selective market opening has been the consensus in recent years while the current thinking on trade and poverty linkages raises more questions than solutions. Therefore, trade policy making should address the following questions: (i) who sets the agenda? (ii) who carries it out and how? (iii) who evaluates its impact? He emphasised that trade policy should be reliable rather than ad hoc, but also pragmatic and pro-business as it is the private sector that undertakes trading activities. However, increased bias towards the business community can also reduce resources for redistributive purposes.

He also raised some questions such as- (i) who speaks for the poor? (ii) what are the interests of the poor? (iii) who are the poor? It is often incorrectly assumed that the poor are a homogenous group, however, they can be defined by income level, by the extent of

participation in the formal sector, by geography (urban/rural), by socio-economic status, by economic activity and by country. Hence, trade liberalisation may have varied impacts on different types of the poor.

He added that if CSOs are the voice for the poor, the inconclusive link between trade and poverty reduction makes their job more challenging, as they will have a difficult time defending the interests of the poor with lack of consensus on the linkages. Therefore, future TDP projects may need to carefully address some fundamental questions like (i) How strong is the link between trade liberalisation and growth? (ii) How quickly will trade liberalisation translate into poverty reduction? (iii) Is trade liberalisation sufficient for poverty reduction? (iv) How comprehensive should market opening be to achieve the desired results?

He pointed out that the issue of adjustment, compensation and safety nets are not straightforward. Raising some questions like -what is adjustment, to what extent can people be retrained and whether an individual who loses a job will receive an alternative activity, he elaborated that in European countries vacancies and unemployment exists side by side. This is mostly due to lack of needed job training and unwillingness of people to move from one location to another. In terms of compensation issues in trade, the practically was questioned with regards to who would finance it and who would qualify for such schemes?

With developing countries growing faster than developed countries in recent years, they are becoming interesting and lucrative markets themselves. As a result protectionist measures adopted by OECD countries may shift to the big developing countries. Some of the new dimensions of trade have been growth of intra-industry trade as a result of product fragmentation, changes in technology influencing production structures and the demand for quality products by consumers. In addition to quality, speeds of delivery and product standards are increasingly becoming important in the Northern markets. Therefore, maintaining quality, adhering with product standards and on time delivery needs to be given priority by developing countries exports looking to expand market shares in the North. Adequate information flows and innovation have also been some of the missing links towards development and poverty reduction.

While we face an uncertain economic future, which could prompt a rise in protectionist measures, he emphasised that openness and being connected to the world market is the superior option.

2.14 Floor Discussion

The floor discussion mostly focused on weak interaction amongst the country partners at the horizontal level, and touched upon strategies on how such south-south partnerships, information sharing and interactions can be enhanced in the future. In order to improve south-south partnerships among CSOs of South Asia, Africa and East Asia, it was suggested that institutions host a blog to share their knowledge and information related to their work and advocacy strategies.

It was pointed out that some positive spillovers of the TDP project were a direct spin-off project -“FEATS” which is looking at the trade policy making process in five African countries and the use of TDP research outcome for EPA studies and consultations. While many stakeholders and partners were involved in the TDP study, there was sub-optimal interaction among them post advocacy events. Hence, it was doubtful if blogs would be successful, however, a blog- e-mail group could be created.

The need for regular physical meetings was emphasised for sustained interaction between southern TDP partners. However, concerns were raised regarding limited funds for such regular physical meetings. It was opined that due to CUTS undertaking the management of the TDP projects across countries, such hierarchical structure had weakened the local ownership of the programs, hence, there was a need for horizontal linkages.

An immediate, cost-effective solution was to create an intra-net documentation on partner activities and updates in the TDP website. Some partner organizations indicated that resource constraints in terms of their small size and frequent field missions limit them from delivering quick responses to southern partner queries, which subsequently results in decreased interactions. It was also inquired whether CUTS can play a role in knowledge development and capacity building of southern partners that have weak institutional capacity and limited resources.

In many instances when the research and advocacy component of the TDP project was being handled by two organisations in the same country, despite working on parallel issues, there were not enough coordination and interactions between them. It was suggested that both the research and advocacy partners should work together from the start so that the latter would be knowledgeable on the research component, how to process and sell it to the public. When the advocacy partner is brought in towards the end phase of the research, it will be difficult at times for the advocacy partner to understand and defend ideas of the researcher during public forums. However, a research partner opined that in such projects, the organisation carrying out research should have more say towards what types of platforms and stakeholders to approach for research dissemination.

With regards to queries about how south-south partner linkages could be designed into the projects, it was suggested that one could identify organisations engaged in both research and advocacy work together. The need to find an organisations’ turf and then select three or four possible partners for collaboration on future projects was emphasised. This would also eliminate the need for frequent partner evaluations.

Replication of best practices is not always appropriate since countries’ differ in many contexts and one would also need to understand the external fundamentals as they may affect replication of best practices borrowed from other countries. The issues of policy space should therefore be re-examined on how it can best be applied. Some countries succeeded in their trade development through adopting some measures, which would not be applicable today in other countries.

Conclusion

This session unearthed a lot of knowledge and useful inside information on the impact, outreach, successes, limitations and challenges of the TDP project in various partner countries. While the evaluation findings provided recommendations and lessons for future such projects drawing from the multi-country TDP study at the macro level, the perceptions from TDP country partners provided a microscopic view on individual success stories and challenges. It was emphasised that the momentum generated from the TDP project should be carried on by continuing spin-off projects and continued advocacy as well as through strengthened south-south partnerships.

Various advocacy toolkits developed highlighted the need to supplement trade liberalisation with flanking policies. This is an opportunity for future projects to carry out research on the nature of these flanking policies and look towards how they can be effectively implemented. Moreover, it was emphasised that there is a need for more interaction between southern country partners via physical meetings, online information and knowledge sharing and learning from each other's experiences.

List of Participants

Name	Coordinates
Anushaya Collure	TDP Project Officer Law & Society Trust 3, Kynsey Terrace Colombo 8 Sri Lanka Phone: +94.11.269 1228,268 4845 Fax: +94.11.268 6843 Mobile: - Email: anushaya@gmail.com; lst@eureka.lk
Anwarul Hoda	IAS Retd. Former Member Planning Commission of India New Delhi India Phone: - Fax: - Mobile: +91-98998 08055/ 98101 01516 Email: anwarhoda@yahoo.com
Cezley Sampson	Principal Consultant, CPCS, Transcom Limited 72 Chamberlain Avenue Ottawa Canada Privatisation & Regulatory Consultant 16 Devon Square Kingston 10 Jamaica WI Phone: +1-876-322 8940; 876 631 5096 Fax: - Mobile: +1-876-322 8940/44-774 802 7070 (Faye) Email: cezley@yahoo.com; csampson@cpcstrans.com

Datuk M. Supperamaniam	Former Ambassador / Permanent Representative of Malaysia to WTO No. 8, Jalan Terasek Satu, Bangsar Baru Kuala Lumpur 59100 Malaysia Tel: +60-3-2284 5477 Fax: +60-3-2284 5477 Mobile: +60-12-973 3277/ Email: maniams@streamyx.com
David O. Ong'olo	Principal Consultant Spellman & Walker Co. Ltd. PO Box: 57312-00200 Nairobi Kenya Phone: +254-20-313 495/247 554/675 2300 Fax: +254-2-212 681 Mobile: +254-722-524 958 Email: davidongolo@yahoo.com
Dharshani Premaratne	Research Assistant Institute of Policies Studies of Sri Lanka 99 St Michaels Road Colombo 3 Sri Lanka Phone: +94.11.243 1368 Fax: +94-11-243 1395 Mobile: - Email: dharshani@ips.lk;
Fred Miencha	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis, KIPPR Bishops Garden Towers, 2nd Floor Bishops Road, P.O Box: 56445 – 00200 Nairobi Kenya Phone: Phone: +254 -20-2 719933/4, 2714714/5 Fax: +254- 20- 2719951 Mobile: - Email: fred@kippra.or.ke
Gijsbert Van Liemt	Ystadsvägen 48 Johanneshov SE-12149 Sweden Phone: +46.8391411/739703495 Fax: - Mobile: - Email: gbvanliemt@yahoo.com
Kazi Mahmudur Rahman	Senior Research Associate Centre for Policy Dialogue (CPD) House 40/C, Road 11, Dhanmondi R/A Dhaka 1209 Bangladesh Phone: +880-2-812 4770/ 914 1703/34 Fax: +880-2-813 0951 Mobile: - Email: mahmud@cpd.org.bd; mahmud@cpd-bangladesh.org, ratul_25@hotmail.com
Kibre Moges	Senior Researcher Trade & Industry Research Division Ethiopian Economic Policy Research Institute (EEPRI) PO Box: 34282 Addis Ababa Ethiopia Phone: +251-11-645 3200 (O) / 251-11-1556 62 (R) Fax: + 251-11-645 3020 Mobile: - Email: kibmog@gmail.com; kimoges@yahoo.com

Kimera Henry Richard	Chief Executive Consumer Education Trust of Uganda (CONSENT) Desai House, Plot 4, Parliament Avenue, PO Box: 1433 Kampala Uganda Phone: +256-41-438 4557 Fax: +256-41-426 8687 (TF) Mobile: +256-75 150 2441/256-77 250 2441 Email: consentug@yahoo.com; heriki@hotmail.com; info.consent@yahoo.com; consumeducatrust@netscape.net
L. M. Bhandari	General Manager Rajasthan Chamber of Commerce & Industry (RCCI) Rajasthan Chamber Bhawan, M. I. Road Jaipur 302 003 India Phone: +91-141-256 5163 Fax: -91-141-256 1419/ 2610 Mobile: -91-94140 53860 Email: bhandarilm@yahoo.com; info@rajchamber.com
M. A. Razzaque	Economic Adviser Economic Affairs Division, Commonwealth Secretariat Marlborough House Pall Mall London SW1Y 5HX UK Phone: +44-20-7747 6273 (D) / + 44-20-8518 2670 (R) Fax: +44-20-7004 3590 (D) / 7747 6235 (Gen) Mobile: +44-750 669 4329 Email: m.razzaque@commonwealth.int; razzaque_duecon@yahoo.com
Matthew Morris	Senior Economic Adviser DFID India B-28, Tara Crescent, Qutub Institutional Area New Delhi 110 016 India Phone: +91-11-4279 3462 (D)/ 2652 9123 Ext#3462 Fax: +91-11-2652 9296 Mobile: +91-97117 50491 Email: matthew-morris@dfid.gov.uk
Miriam W.O Omolo	Trade Programme Officer Institute of Economic Affairs 5th Floor, ACK Garden House, 1st Ngong Avenue, PO Box 53989-00200 Nairobi Kenya Phone: +254-20-271 6231/ 272 1262/271 7402 Fax: +254 (20) 2716231 Mobile: 0725 24625 Email: miriamomolo@ieakenya.or.ke
Mohammed Abu Eusuf	Associate Professor, Department of Development Studies, University of Dhaka Dhaka 1000 Bangladesh Phone:+ 880-22-966 1920-23 Ext#6520 Fax: +880-2-861 5583 Mobile: +880-171 287 444 Email: eusuf101@yahoo.com

Mosadeq Sahebodin	Secretary General Institute for Consumer Protection (ICP) 1, Pont St Louis Street, Pailles Mauritius Phone: +230-210 4433/ 6262 Fax: +230-212 2683/230 4436 Mobile: +230-757 1438 Email: mosadeq53@orange.mu
Mukasa Misusera	Director of Programmes Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations P.O. Box 11224 Kampala Uganda Phone: +256.414.530 575/ 531.150 Fax: +256.41.531 236 Mobile: +256772400885 Email: mmu@deniva.or.ug
N. C. Pahariya	Professor, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences & Head, Departement of Economics, University of Rajasthan Fellow CUTS International Navkaar, 175-C, Milap Nagar, Tonk Road Jaipur 302 018 India Phone: +911412700681 (O) / +911412721751 (R) Fax: - Mobile: +919887091002 Email: ncpahariya@gmail.com; ncp@cuts.org
Ngo Huong	Founder/Board of Advisors Centre for Development and Integration 176 Thai Ha, Dong Da Hanoi Vietnam Phone: +84.4.857 4316 Fax: +84-4-3537 7479 Mobile: +84-9041 63429 Email: nmhuongvn@yahoo.com
Posh Raj Pandey	President South Asia Watch on Trade, Economics & Environment (SAWTEE) PO Box: 19366, 254, Lamtangeen Marg, Baluwatar Kathmandu Nepal Phone: +977-1-441 5824/ 444 4438 Fax: +977-1-444 4570 Mobile: +977-98510 44531 Email: prpandey@yahoo.com; sawtee@sawtee.org
Pranav Kumar	Senior Trade Policy Adviser British High Commission Shanti Path, Chanakyapuri New Delhi 110 021 India Phone: +91-11-2419 2100/ 2419 2383 Fax: +91-11-2687 0062 Mobile: + 91-99105 05897 Email: pranav.kumar@fco.gov.uk

Qasim Qureshi	Acting Chief Executive Asian Institute of Trade and Development 5, Street 9, F-8/3 Islamabad Pakistan Phone: +92-51-225 3351/ 54/ 0657/ 226 3670 Fax: +92-51-226 0675/ 2082 Mobile: - Email: aيتد@comsats.net.pk; qasim81@hotmail.com
Randall Jon Soderquist	Senior Trade Program Associate Center for Global Development 1800 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Third Floor Washington, DC 20036 US Phone: +202-416-4011 Fax: +202-416-4050, Mobile: +1-202-294 9453 Email: RSoderquist@CGDEV.ORG
S. Chakravarthy	Adviser/Consultant on Competition Policy and Law 6-3-864/2B, Sadat Manzil, Begumpet Hyderabad 500 016 Andhra Pradesh India Phone: +91-40-2776 5837 (O) / +91-40-2341 3949/ 3184 (R) Fax: +91-40-2776 5836/ 2323 1249 Mobile: +91-94404 09667 Email: chakravarthy38@gmail.com; chakravarthy38@hotmail.com
S. V. Divvaakar	Managing Director Ace Global Private Limited 335,338, Centrum Plaza, Golf Link Road, Sector-53 Gurgaon 122 011 India Phone: +91-124-424 1050-52 Fax: +91-124-424 1053 Mobile: +91-098102 68073/ 099999 86085 Email: svdivvaakar@aceglobalonline.com; svdivvaakar@gmail.com
Selim Raihan	Executive Director South Asia Network on Economic Modeling (SANEM) House 13, Road 108, Gulshan 2 Dhaka 1212 Bangladesh Phone: +880-2-882 1776 (O) / +880-2-721 2132 (R) Fax: +880-2-862 2320 Mobile: +880-171 416 8866 Email: selim.raihan@gmail.com; sraihan_duecon@yahoo.com; sanem@sanemnet.org Associate Professor Dept of Economics, Dhaka University Dhaka 1000 Bangladesh Phone: +880-2-966 4422/ 1920-73 Fax: +880-2-861 5583
Shaheen Rafi Khan	Research Fellow Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI) 3 UN Boulevard, Diplomatic Enclave 1, G-5, PO Box: 342 Islamabad Pakistan Phone: +92-51-227 0674-6/5642/8134 (O) / +92-51-282 3443 (R) Fax: +92-51-227 8135 Mobile: - Email: shaheen@sdpi.org; darya@apollo.net.pk

Shakeel Ahmed	Research Associate Sustainable Development Policy Institute 3 UN Boulevard, Diplomatic Enclave 1, G-5 Islamabad Pakistan Phone: +92-51-2278134 Fax : +92-51-300-5382295 Mobile: -0321-5382295 Email: shakeel@sdpi.org; shakeelramay@gmail.com
Sunny Sebastian	Special Correspondent The Hindu 33-A Dhuleshwar Garden, Sardar Patel Marg, C-Scheme Jaipur 302 001 India Phone + 911412377704 Fax: +91141 2375959 Mobile: +919829067181 Email : mariyapr@datainfosys.net; thehindujaipur@dataone.in
Taifur Rahman	Unnayan Shamannay 2/E/1-B Mymensingh Road, Shahbagh Dhaka 1000 Bangladesh Phone: +880-2-861 0332/865 0015 Fax: +880-2-862 2320 Mobile: +880-171 345 6565 Email: taifur75@yahoo.com; taifur@shiree.org

CUTS International

Pradeep S Mehta	Secretary General, CUTS International D-217, Bhaskar Marg, Bani Park Jaipur 302 016 India Phone: +91 141 2282821 (Board) / +91 141 2280968 (Direct) Fax: +91 141 2282485 Mobile: +91 98290 13131 / +44 79240 01592 Email: sg@cuts.org
Siddhartha Mitra	Director (Research), CUTS & Head, CUTS Centre for International Trade, Economics & Environment (CUTS CITEE) D-217 Bhaskar Marg, Bani Park Jaipur 302 016 India Phone: +91.141.2282821 Fax: +91.141.2282485 Mobile: +91-97833 98920 Email: sm2@cuts.org; citee@cuts.org
Angela Mulenga	CUTS-CITEE, Centre Coordinator, Africa Resource Centre No. 6078/A, Great East Road, Northmead Lusaka, Zambia Phone: +260-211-294 892 Fax: - Mobile: +260-966 425 784 Email: lusaka@cuts.org, amm@cuts.org

Atul Kaushik	Director, CUTS Geneva Resource Centre 37-39, Rue de Vermont 1202 Geneva Switzerland Phone: +41.22.734.6080-82 Fax:+41.22.734.3914 Mobile: +91-99296 49122 / +41-78769 8551 E-mail: ak@cuts.org
Alice Pham Thi Que Anh	CUTS HRC (Hanoi Resource Centre) No. 14/16 Nguyen Phuc Lai St, Dong Da District Hanoi Vietnam Phone: +84-4-2219 4858 Fax: +84-4-3514 8978 Mobile: +84-9863 10179 Email ap@cuts.org; hanoi@cuts.org
Julian Mukiibi	CUTS Geneva Resource Centre 37-39, Rue de Vermont 1202 Geneva Switzerland Phone: +41.22.734.6080-82 Fax:+41.22.734.3914 Mobile: +41-76256 1399 E-mail: ak@cuts.org
Victor Ogalo Omondi	Project Officer, CUTS NRC (Nairobi Resource Centre) Yaya Court-2nd Flr, No.5, Ring Rd, Kilimani off Argwings Kodhed Rd, PO Box: 8188-00200 Nairobi Kenya Phone: +254-20-386 2149-50/232 9112 Fax: +254-20-2386 2149 (TF) Mobile: +254-721 405 835 Email: nairobi@cuts.org; voo@cuts.org