

were to be given a free pass in this regard. It is an optimistic view, it was suggested, that sound development outcomes could nonetheless be achieved through greater cooperation between the World Bank and the WTO processes such as the discussion of policy frameworks supported by trade-related technical assistance (TRTA) in the context of the "integrated framework". The integrated framework, it was suggested, is not working. For one thing, it is hard to sort out when aid is just "aid" and when it is "aid for trade"—not to mention when it is "new" and when it is just "re-profiled" existing money (the sense of some observers is that there is actually little if any new money). It was pointed out that "aid for trade" would involve earmarking aid, which goes against the last five years of World Bank policy against such earmarking. And there is a confusion of programs—Aid for Trade, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), and Millenium Development Goals (MDGs) are all overlapping frameworks for disbursement of aid.

Given the current perspective, some observers found it hard to imagine that the notion of trade ministers delivering "development" was ever taken seriously. This would require, it was suggested, a level of coordination of domestic agencies that is difficult, and of international agencies that is impossible, to achieve. A multilateral trade agreement was not going to be the catalyst for such a coordination of effort.

In turn, it was argued, this more realistic perspective has brought a new-found clarity as to what development now means in the Round. Conceptually, it was argued, the term "development" in the Doha Round context must be recognized to mean development as understood by trade negotiators rather than by the development community. That is why development in the Round is associated so closely with agricultural trade; the WTO is the forum in which agricultural trade is best negotiated and that is the area where the trade negotiations have the greatest leverage on the development function—even if agriculture might have been "oversold" as a development tool. Thus, at a minimum, development in the Round means increased market access in agriculture, which is what was not obtained in the Uruguay Round and which continues to be lacking in the Doha round.