

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **SCE Chair's Report to SOM**

#### Background Information

The SCE met on 21 April 2007. The new SCE Chair, Luis Quesada of Peru, chaired the meeting. He reiterated the importance of continuing to move forward on the reform agenda and he re-affirmed his commitment as Chair to ensure the effective implementation of the Fora Review recommendations and the ongoing review of fora.

Information and updates on the SCE Fora Review implementation was discussed during the meeting (2007/SOM2/SCE/08).

As part of implementing recommendation 12 of the Fora Review, the SCE endorsed the following:

1. The Guidelines for Lead Shepherds and Chairs (Attachment 1)
2. The Guidelines for the Establishment of new fora (Attachment 2)
3. The Program of Independent Assessments (Attachment 3)

The SCE also endorsed mechanisms to improve the project management process:

- a. That SOM delegate the approval of SOM Taskforce projects to the SCE.
- b. SCE instruct that the Secretariat Project Assessment Panel (SPAP) assessment be conducted on all APEC projects, including EC, FMP and SOM.
- c. SCE instructs the Secretariat to develop a project submission timetable at the beginning of each APEC year.

The SCE also discussed the proposed Mining Working Group which was developed in response to the SCE Fora Review recommendation to merge the Non-Ferrous Metals Dialogue (NFMD) and the Energy Working Group (EWG) sub-fora Expert Group on Mining, Exploration and Energy Development (GEMEED).

The SCE instructed that the final proposal to be submitted to SCE III should include a detailed case and adhere to the guidelines of establishing new fora. The proposal should also include discussion on options, including remaining as a sub-fora or becoming a task force.

The SCE endorsed the proposal to transform the Health Task Force (HTF) into a working group (2007/SOM2/SCE/05) as recommended by recommendation 11 of the SCE Fora Review (Attachment 4).

The SCE endorsed the workplans submitted by the working groups and SOM task forces (2007/SOM2/SCE/04).

#### Recommendations

It is recommended that SOM:

1. Take note of the SCE Chair's Report to SOM.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **SCE Chair's Report to SOM**

#### Background Information

The SCE met on 21 April 2007. The new SCE Chair, Luis Quesada of Peru, chaired the meeting. He reiterated the importance of continuing to move forward on the reform agenda and he re-affirmed his commitment as Chair to ensure the effective implementation of the Fora Review recommendations and the ongoing review of fora.

Information and updates on the SCE Fora Review implementation was discussed during the meeting (2007/SOM2/SCE/08).

As part of implementing recommendation 12 of the Fora Review, the SCE endorsed the following:

1. The Guidelines for Lead Shepherds and Chairs (Attachment 1)
2. The Guidelines for the Establishment of new fora (Attachment 2)
3. The Program of Independent Assessments (Attachment 3)

The SCE also endorsed mechanisms to improve the project management process:

- a. That SOM delegate the approval of SOM Taskforce projects to the SCE.
- b. SCE instruct that the Secretariat Project Assessment Panel (SPAP) assessment be conducted on all APEC projects, including EC, FMP and SOM.
- c. SCE instructs the Secretariat to develop a project submission timetable at the beginning of each APEC year.

The SCE also discussed the proposed Mining Working Group which was developed in response to the SCE Fora Review recommendation to merge the Non-Ferrous Metals Dialogue (NFMD) and the Energy Working Group (EWG) sub-fora Expert Group on Mining, Exploration and Energy Development (GEMEED).

The SCE instructed that the final proposal to be submitted to SCE III should include a detailed case and adhere to the guidelines of establishing new fora. The proposal should also include discussion on options, including remaining as a sub-fora or becoming a task force.

The SCE endorsed the proposal to transform the Health Task Force (HTF) into a working group (2007/SOM2/SCE/05) as recommended by recommendation 11 of the SCE Fora Review (Attachment 4).

The SCE endorsed the workplans submitted by the working groups and SOM task forces (2007/SOM2/SCE/04).

#### Recommendations

It is recommended that SOM:

1. Take note of the SCE Chair's Report to SOM.

2. Endorse the Guidelines for Lead Shepherds and Chairs (Attachment 1), the Guidelines for the Establishment of New Fora (Attachment 2) and the Program of Independent Assessments (Attachment 3).
3. Endorse the proposed mechanisms to improve the project management process as follows
  - a. Delegate the approval of SOM Task force projects to the SCE.
  - b. The Secretariat Project Assessment Panel undertake an assessment on all APEC Projects.
  - c. The Secretariat to develop a project submission timetable at the beginning of each APEC year.
3. Endorse and recommend to Ministers the transformation of the Health Task Force into a working group (Attachment 4).

SCE Chair's Report  
SCEII Meeting  
21 April, 2007  
Adelaide, Australia

The SOM Steering Committee on ECOTECH (SCE) meeting was held in Adelaide, Australia on 21 April, 2007. It was attended by representatives from Australia; Brunei, Canada; Chile; China; Hong Kong, China; Indonesia; Japan; Korea; Malaysia; Mexico; New Zealand; Papua New Guinea; Peru; Philippines; Russia, Singapore; Chinese Taipei; Thailand; the United States, and Viet Nam. Fora representatives from the Gender Focal Point Network (GFPN), Energy Working Group (EWG), Tourism Working Group (TWG) and Non Ferrous Metal Dialogue Expert Group on Mining Exploration and Energy Development (GEMEED) and the APEC Secretariat also attended.

Mr. Luis Quesada of Peru chaired the meeting.

### **1. Welcome by SCE Chair, Luis Quesada**

The SCE Chair welcomed all members to the second SCE meeting of the year and he thanked Ambassador Capunay for his Chairmanship at the first meeting.

He reiterated the importance of continuing to move forward on the reform agenda and he reaffirmed his commitment as Chair to ensure the effective implementation of the Fora Review recommendations and the ongoing review of fora.

### **2. Adoption of the Agenda**

The agenda was adopted.

### **3. SCE Fora Review: implementation and further reform measures**

The Chair noted that information on the work that has been ongoing intersessionally to implement the reform measures was included in the overview paper that has been tabled by the Secretariat (2007/SOM2/SCE/08).

**The Recommendation 1** (The Social Safety Nets Capacity Building Network (SSNCBN) be merged into the Human Resource Development Working Group (HRDWG)).

The APEC Secretariat updated members about the implementation of the Recommendation 1. The Chairs of the Fora have developed a joint terms of reference (ToR). This was discussed and endorsed by the HRDWG meeting that was held in Brisbane from 17-20 April. The HRDWG decided that it would prefer to keep its original name because labour protection is broader than and encompasses Social Safety Nets. The ToR will be distributed to SSNCBN for their consideration and a final draft will be submitted to SCE III.

**Recommendation 6** (The Cultural Focal Point Network (CFPN) be disbanded).

Helen Cox, Chair of the Tourism Working Group (TWG) provided the members of an update on discussions within the TWG and reaffirmed the group's commitment to support the APEC Reform process.

The TWG and the HRDWG are working on how they will incorporate culture into their work programs and will report back to the SCE III.

**Recommendation 7** (further consideration be given to the suggestions for improving the operations of the Telecommunications and Information Working Group (TELWG) and Electronic Commerce Steering Group (ECSG) in 2007).

The Mexican SOM updated the SCE on discussions held in the Committee on Trade and Investment (CTI). There was broad consensus in the CTI that the ECSG should become a CTI sub-fora. However, additional time was requested to consider the issue further. Therefore, the CTI agreed that it would work on this intersessionally.

**Recommendation 8** (The Trade Promotion Working Group (WGTP) be incorporated into the Small and Medium Enterprises Working Group (SMEWG)).

The SME tabled a paper updating the SCE about the Outcomes of the March 2007 SME Meetings (2007/SOM2/SCE/003). Australia updated the meeting on their behalf. The new merged working group is scheduled to meet in late August for the first joint meeting.

**Recommendation 10** (further consideration be given to the possibilities for improving synergies between the Anti-Corruption Task Force (ACT) and the Economic Committee (EC), taking account of related work being conducted in CTI sub-fora such as Strengthening Economic Legal Infrastructure (SELI) and the Competition Policy and Deregulation Group (CPDG))

The ACT Chair sent a message (2007/SOM2/SCE/008a) to the Secretariat on 16 April reporting on the outcomes of the consultation process with the CTI and EC Chairs. The Chairs have agreed that the work programmes of the three bodies, while mutually reinforcing, are separate and discrete and involve quite individual streams of activity and participating officials. They do not recommend any changes to structure or lines of reporting at this stage.

To maximize synergies and minimize the future scope for duplication, the Chairs have agreed to annually review each others work programmes, and take opportunities to attend meetings of the other two bodies to discuss activities of mutual interest and assess the scope for cooperation and collaboration".

**Recommendation 12** (the list of suggestions for improving working arrangements).

The Secretariat to updated members about the new guidelines under Recommendation 12. (2007/SOM2/SCE/10 & Annexes A-F).

SCE members endorsed:

4. The Guidelines for Lead Shepherds and Chairs (Annex A)
5. The Guidelines for the Establishment of New Fora (Annex B)
6. The program of Independent Assessments (Annex D)

On annex E, Chile requested that a clearer reporting line through SCE be included for working groups. The Secretariat advised it would revise the structure and distribute it intersessionally.

The SCE endorsed mechanisms to improve the project management process (Annex C):

- a. SCE recommends that SOM delegate the approval of SOM Taskforce projects to the SCE.

- b. SCE instruct that the SPAP assessment be conducted on all APEC projects, including EC, FMP and SOM
- c. SCE instructs the Secretariat to develop a project submission timetable at the beginning of each APEC year.

The Secretariat invited SCE members to provide feedback on reporting needs through a survey that would be undertaken intersessionally. The Secretariat also requested feedback on suggestions on the calendar reform within 4 weeks (Annex F).

The SCE Chair noted that the ongoing reform is of critical importance for ECOTECH and invited members to propose and discuss and new areas for the further reform of APEC's economic and technical cooperation activities.

#### **4. SCE to consider new Working Group proposals/mandates**

##### **Mining Working Group**

**Recommendation 3** (The Non-Ferrous Metals Dialogue (NFMD) be incorporated into the EWG sub-fora Expert Group on Mining, Exploration and Energy Development (GEMEED)).

The SCE Chair updated members about the Mining Ministers meeting in Perth. Ministers noted the proposal to establish a Mining Working Group and instructed mining officials to develop a detailed proposal for presentation to SCE III and the APEC Senior Officials, including objectives, terms of reference and operating procedures. The proposed new Working group would include the newly merged NFMD and GEMEED.

A representative of the NFMD and GEMEED updated the SCE on Progress. The NFMD met on 16 April to discuss the merger. The Group welcomed the recommendation to merge the NFMD and GEMEED. NFMD agreed that the 'merged group' would cover mining, minerals and metals issues from extraction through to processing and also cover issues of trade and investment. The NFMD tabled a report to SCE (2007/SOM2/SCE/008b). A final proposal is not expected to be received until SOM3 when the issue can be considered more fully.

Several members expressed concerns about the proposal because of the performance issues of both groups, including difficulties meeting quorum.

The SCE instructed that the final proposal should include a detailed case and should adhere to the guidelines of establishing new Fora. The proposal should also include the discussion on options, including remaining as a subfora or becoming a task force.

Russia agreed that it would take this comments into consideration when preparing the final detailed proposal for submission to SCE III.

##### **Health Working Group**

**Recommendation 11** (required that further consideration be given to transforming the Health Task Force (HTF) to a Working Group during the review of its mandate in 2007)

Canada introduced a paper tabled by the HTF on this issue entitled HTF Beyond 2007 (2007/SOM2/SCE/05), which responded to the Ministerial recommendation and that agreed the HTF become a Working Group.

SCE members expressed support for the proposal. The SCE requested HTF submit ToR and workplan to the committee for endorsement. The SCE the proposal and formally endorsed the recommendation that the HTF become a working group.

## **5. Working group and SOM Taskforce programs**

All SCE Fora except the Transportation Working Group (TPTWG) submitted the workplans for endorsement (2007/SOM2/SCE/004a-p). The GFPN and EWG representatives highlighted the key components of their workplans.

The SCE endorsed the workplans.

The SCE Chair advised that he would contact the TPTWG Lead Shepherd and remind him that it is compulsory for all working groups to submit the work plan to SCE for approval.

## **6. Strengthening the Implementation of ECOTECH Activities**

### **The TWG 2006 Independent Assessment**

TWG Chair, Helen Cox, updated the SCE members about the independent assessment. She advised that after extensive delays and although the draft report had still not received from the consultant, the TWG had decided to prepare a report based on the preliminary findings.

This report was tabled for SCE consideration (2007/SOM2/SCE/009).

The SCE Chair thanked the TWG Chair for the report and efforts to reform the TWG.

The SCE endorsed the report and requested that the TWG report back to this Committee on the progress. The SCE Chair also suggested that the TWG Chair and APEC Secretariat discuss setting a fixed deadline for the consultant, after which the contract will be canceled.

### **The 2007 Independent Assessments**

The APEC Secretariat updated members on the implementation of the recommendations **2, 4 and 5**, which involved an independent assessment of the Marine Resource Conservation Working Group (MRC), Agriculture Technical Cooperation Working Group (ATCWG) & High Level Policy Dialogue on Agriculture Biotechnology (HLPDAB) and Gender Focal Point Network (GFPN). This project was approved by BMC1.

The ToR was developed after extensive consultation with members and Fora. It has now been finalized and circulated and nominations have been sought from members. The deadline for the submission of nominations is 30 April. The SCE Chair, and chairs of the relevant fora will be consulted during the selection process and the final selection submitted to SCE for approval.

### **Other issues**

Australia welcomed the BMC decision to adopt the QAF for TILF projects and reiterated the importance of improving quality of APEC projects.

In light of their ongoing commitment to strengthening APEC projects, Australia announced that an additional Australian official (Derek Taylor) will be seconded to the APEC Secretariat to assist with the development of the project advisory unit.

Australia also announced that it would undertake consultations with members about the possibility of self-funding a survey about SCE fora engagement with international and regional multilateral organizations.

## **7. Disseminating the Benefits of ECOTECH**

### **1) 2007 SOM Report on Economic and Technical Cooperation**

The SCE endorsed the draft outline of the 2007 SOM Report on ECOTECH.

## **8. Other business**

The SCE Chair drew members attention to the for information EWG paper (2007/SOM2/SCE/006) which reports on the outcomes of a review of the APEC Energy Working Group Projects. The *draft* report demonstrates the positive work being done in the Working Groups.

Japan updated members about their One Village One Product project (2007/SOM2/SCE/002).

The SCE Chair reminded members of the importance of senior officials attending the SCE being a SOM level committee.



**ATTACHMENT 1****Guidelines for Lead Shepherd/Chair and Deputy Lead Shepherd/Chair of APEC Working Groups and SOM Taskforces**

*(Excluding the Budget Management Committee (BMC); the Committee of Trade and Investment (CTI) and its sub-fora; the Economic Committee (EC); the SOM Steering Committee for Economic and Technical Cooperation (SCE) and Finance Ministers Process (FMP)).*

**Introduction**

Until 1994, there were no guidelines for the Chair or Lead Shepherd at the level of APEC Working Groups. In some cases, the Working Groups by consultation and consensus, had defined their own set of guidelines and rotation system.

In May 1994 in Bali, Indonesia, APEC Senior Officials endorsed the BAC recommendation that APEC Working Groups and other APEC Fora select a Lead Shepherd or a Coordinator to serve for a one -to-two-year period on a rotation basis. The objective of this decision was to improve efficiency and coordination.

*The Consolidated Guidelines on the Rotation System for Lead Shepherd / Chair and Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair of APEC Working Groups and other APEC Fora Principles* was endorsed in 1998 to provide clarity to the roles and to the rotation system of Lead Shepherds and Chairs.

In 2006, the SCE undertook a comprehensive review of all Working groups and SOM Taskforces and recommended several improvements for working arrangements. This update of the Consolidated Guidelines reflects the recommendations of the review and replaces the 1998 Guidelines. The original guidelines are attached below and areas updated highlighted.

**Basic principles**

1. The APEC principles applying to chairing APEC Ministerial and APEC Informal Leaders Meeting remain unmodified.
2. These guidelines are consistent with APEC principles of voluntarism and consensus building, as any member economy may express its interest and be selected as Lead Shepherd / Chair or Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair of a Working Group or other APEC Fora.
3. These guidelines aim to enhance wider participation, shared leadership, and to ensure that more members assume the role and responsibility of Lead Shepherd / Chair or Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair, as well as, to promote a greater synergy in the activities of Working Groups and other APEC Fora.
4. These guidelines allow for flexibility in their implementation on the grounds of the reality of each individual Working Group or other APEC Fora.

## Guidelines

1. Each APEC Working Group and other APEC Fora will select a Lead Shepherd / Chair, who will have a minimum two-year term (two calendar years). Exceptions to this rule require approval by the groups concerned as well as SCE.<sup>1</sup>
2. One or more Deputy Lead Shepherds / Chairs will be selected by the Working Groups and other APEC Fora to assist the Lead Shepherd / Chair.
3. In the event that the Lead Shepherd / Chair could not continue with his/her duties, the Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair will assume the position of the Lead Shepherd / Chair for the remainder of the calendar year, or until a new Chair is nominated.
4. If the Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair is unable to continue with his/her duties, a new Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair would be selected.
5. At the last meeting --within the time frame of the two-year term -- a new Lead Shepherd / Chair and a new Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair will be selected --on a rotation or volunteer basis-- by each APEC Working Group and / or APEC Fora.
6. A Lead Shepherd / Chair should not normally serve for more than two consecutive two-year terms as Lead Shepherd / Chair of a Working Group and other APEC Fora.
7. None of the above mentioned procedures prevent a particular Working Group and other APEC fora --on the grounds of their own reality-- from establishing an Advisory Committee to ensure assistance, support and continuity in the tasks and responsibilities allocated to the Lead Shepherd / Chair or Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair of a Working Group and other APEC Fora.

### **The duties of the Lead Shepherd / Chair of a Working Group and/or other APEC Fora.**

- coordinate the schedule and chair meetings as well as prepare reports of the meetings.
- lead the implementation of the Action Program and other activities to fulfill instructions given by APEC Leaders, Ministers and Senior Officials and report to Senior Officials on the development of these issues.
- oversee the development of activities ensuring that the work is responding to Leaders and Ministers priorities,
- liaise with the APEC secretariat, other APEC fora, and international organizations to enhance the quality of activities including project proposals with well defined outcomes and track the progress of project implementation
- act as the spokesperson for the relevant Working Group or APEC Fora .

The duties of the Deputy Lead Shepherd / Chair will be to assist the Lead Shepherd / Chair to fulfill their mandate and the activities of the Working Group or other APEC Fora.

---

<sup>1</sup> Suggestions have been made that this be a 'minimum of two years' to enable flexibility for fora with longer term chairs.

Further information to assist Lead Shepherds and chairs about hosting meetings can be found in the *Guidebook on APEC Procedures and Practices; Guidelines for Hosting APEC meetings; and the Guidebook on APEC projects*

**The level of assistance that the Chair/Lead Shepherd can expect from the APEC Secretariat's Program Director.**

The Program Directors (PDs) are officials seconded by member economies to work for the APEC Secretariat for duration of normally three years. They are usually officials with different backgrounds and experience, and may not possess technical expertise in the particular subject area of the forum. As, their responsibilities may cover more than one forum or assignment PDs are unable to fully support the Chair/Lead Shepherd as a full-time assistant. It is desirable that the Chair/Lead Shepherd seek his/her own staff for personal assistance and utilize the PD in a way that best serves the group.

While the Chair/Lead Shepherd of an APEC forum is responsible for coordination and overseeing of the activities conducted by that forum, the Program Director (PD) can assist the Chair/Lead Shepherd in the following areas:

- maintenance of the relevant public website and APEC Collaboration System (ACS) site for the group;
- preparation of the draft meeting agenda;
- coordination with members of the group;
- conveying messages from the Chair/Lead Shepherd with regard to the meeting;
- taking minutes and/or preparation of the summary record of the meeting, if required;
- following-up the agreed decisions by the group during the inter-sessional period; and
- supporting implementation of APEC projects

Maintenance of Public Website and ACS Site for the group

All APEC fora will have their webpage posted in the APEC Secretariat's website for public access. The group's ACS site serves as an online space for members to undertake inter-sessional work, collaboration, discussion and information-sharing. The PD will be responsible for maintaining and updating the contents of both sites.

The APEC Secretariat's website also contains the Events Calendar which provided information on APEC-related events throughout the year. The PD can assist in publicizing events or meetings when information is available from the Chair/Lead Shepherd or organiser of the events.

Preparation of the meeting agenda

If requested, the PD can assist in the preparation of draft the meeting agenda based on the outcomes of the previous meeting. Once this is approved by the Chair/Lead Shepherd, the PD can circulate the draft to all members for comment and keep it up to date. It is desirable that the draft agenda be circulated at least four weeks before the meeting.

In the meeting, the role of the PD is to facilitate the meeting; provide information on the latest developments in APEC; and advise on procedural matters regarding participation in APEC meetings, participation of APEC officials in non-APEC meetings, submission of meeting documents, and implementation of APEC projects.

At the first annual meeting of the forum, it is customary that the PD will table a report on APEC Developments so that the group is informed of the current theme, sub-themes, priorities and major decisions adopted by Leaders, Ministers and Senior Officials since their last meetings. In addition, the PD may brief the group on other issues of interest to the forum such as SOM and relevant committee-level instructions, project deadlines, and any other important but yet unresolved issue within the group for consideration.

The documentation process is vital to ensure that all meeting documents are complete and kept by the APEC Secretariat Library for dissemination to members and the public. The PD will help the host and the Chair/Lead Shepherd to properly prepare all documents according to the Meeting Documents Guidelines. Once the meeting is completed, the PD will need to collect all meeting documents and submit to the APEC Secretariat Library.

During the course of the meeting, questions may be raised by members on the procedures and practices in APEC relating to project implementation, the application for different sources of APEC funding (Operational Account, TILF Fund, APEC Support Fund), etc. The PD can help to clarify these.

#### Coordination with members of the group

As the issues discussed in APEC are often cross-cutting or may have wide implications to other fora, PD will assist in providing information about those cross-cutting or overlapping issues related to the group. PD can also liaise with other fora, if requested, on behalf of the Chair/Lead Shepherd. This usually can be done through internal coordination with other PDs in the Secretariat or directly with the Chair/Lead Shepherd of the other fora.

If the forum wishes to invite Non-APEC member to their meeting, it should consult the PD who will advise the forum on the correct procedure based on the *Revised Consolidated Guidelines on Non-Member Participation in APEC Activities* approved by the AMM in 2005.

#### Conveying messages from the Chair/Lead Shepherd with regard to the meeting

Once agreement has been made to host a meeting, the host economy is expected to move as quickly as possible to decide on the location and exact meeting dates and inform all appropriate APEC contact points. The PD can help disseminate information to all APEC contact points, and advise the host economy and the Chair/Lead Shepherd on suitable arrangements. If the meeting is not held in conjunction with the SOM and Related Meetings, it is advisable that an Administrative Circular be prepared by the host in coordination with the PD and the Chairperson. The Administrative Circular usually includes information such as the responsible host economy contact points, meeting venue, registration/accreditation, arrival/entry formalities, accommodation arrangements, delegates' facilities, document reproduction and distribution procedures, and other useful information. It is preferable to have the Administrative Circular available at least six weeks before the meeting.

If the forum meeting is held in the margins of SOM, the PD will liaise with the Special Assistant (SA) to the Executive Director of the APEC Secretariat who will act as the coordinator with the Task Force or Organizing Committee of the host and provide necessary information including the number of participants, meeting room arrangements, necessary equipment needed to conduct the meeting, and the preferred meeting schedule as requested by their fora.

The Secretariat has produced two documents, namely the *Guidebook on APEC Procedures and Practices* and the *Guidelines for Hosting APEC Meetings* which can help the host in preparing the APEC meetings. These can be requested from the PD.

#### Taking minutes or preparing the summary record of the meeting

As PDs may not be an expert on technical issues discussed in the group, it is advisable that the Chair/Lead Shepherd reach a common understanding with the PD on the level of support in taking minutes or preparing the summary record of the meeting.

As the forum/working group may be required to present its report to higher bodies (e.g. CTI, SCE, and SOM), PD can assist the Chair/Lead Shepherd in preparing a Fora Report to the relevant committee. The template, procedure and deadline of submission of fora reports are usually advised by the relevant Committee's Coordinator.

#### Following-up the agreed decisions by the group during the inter-sessional period

After the meeting is completed, the PD can assist the Chair/Lead Shepherd to develop a list of inter-sessional work items and circulate to members through the ACS site or e-mail or for follow-up. The list shall contain items to be followed up, specific actions required, responsible economy or entity and deadlines. Such a list will help the group to keep track of the agreed follow-up actions or activities. The PD can help to regularly update and follow up with or remind the relevant economy to ensure the completion of the agreed work plan.

The PD can also assist the Chair/Lead Shepherd to contact other fora for follow-up or joint activities, if requested. Coordination with other fora can be done through contacting the relevant fora directly and/or through internal coordination within the Secretariat.

#### Supporting implementation of APEC projects

The PD will be responsible for supporting the Project Overseers (POs) from the initial stage of drafting the proposal, reminding the POs of the necessary requirements e.g. financial rules as spelled out in the *Guidebook on APEC Projects* during the implementation, and collecting the evaluation report after the project is completed. Project Overseers (POs) are encouraged to consult with the PD to ensure their projects fall within APEC's gambit and that the project meets the financial guidelines. With the introduction of the revised Project Database (PDB) in the AIMP in 2007, this collaboration can be done on-line.

If the projects are submitted for OA and ASF funding, the PD can assist with the guidelines and procedure to complete the Quality Assessment Framework (QAF). Full details about how to undertake the Quality Assessment Framework can be seen in the *Guidebook on APEC Project*. Alternatively, the group may encourage members to establish a Small Group on Evaluation to facilitate an effective Evaluation process.

In the process of implementation, e.g. the arrangement of APEC-funded travelers to the meeting or workshop, the PD and his/her Program Assistant (PA) will assist in responding to requests from POs and APEC-funded travelers with regard to authorization for funding and reimbursement claims.

In principle, the PD does not attend any APEC-funded or self-funded meeting organised by the PO. However, an exception may be made if a request is made in writing by the PO to the Executive Director to have a representative from the Secretariat participate in the meeting. Preferably, such a request should be made with the understanding that the PO or organiser is ready to provide funding for the participation of the Secretariat's representative. In any case, it is at the discretion of the Executive Director of the APEC Secretariat to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to send a representative.

If the project is going to publish an official report or publication, the PD, with the assistance of the Director of Communications, can advise on APEC publications and website guidelines, including the use of APEC Logo and graphical elements, and APEC style and nomenclature.

Dissemination of output from APEC projects can be useful and newsworthy. The PD, , with the assistance of the Director of Communications, can assist the PO in preparing media release that can be of interest to the group or public. The PD, with the assistance of the News Manager can also assist the Chair/Lead Shepherd to arrange a briefing or interview with the media on the work done by the group or forum after the meeting.

**ATTACHMENT 2****Guidelines for the Establishment of New APEC Fora**

In 1998, SOM undertook a management review of APEC fora. The final report was submitted to Ministers in November 2000, including, recommendations on criteria for the establishment of new APEC fora.

As part of this review, Ministers agreed on a moratorium on the creation of new fora during the review period and stated that if it becomes absolutely necessary for a forum to be created to deal with unanticipated priorities, it should be in the form of an ad hoc task force under the SOM, with definite life span.

In November 2000, SOM endorsed its *Final Report on the Management Review* including guidelines on the Establishment of New APEC Fora and the rationalisation of the nomenclature of APEC Fora.

In 2006, the SOM Steering Committee on ECOTECH (SCE) undertook a review of all Working Groups and SOM Taskforces and made recommendations for improved working arrangements. As part of this review the SCE reaffirmed the need to adhere to the criteria for the establishment of new APEC Fora and requested the APEC Secretariat review the guidelines to ensure they reflected current policy. The SCE also requested the Secretariat develop guidelines on Fora Terms of Reference (ToR) to ensure all SCE Fora have relevant and focused ToRs. This document includes the new guidelines for ToRs.

**Rationalisation of Nomenclature for APEC Fora**

In 2000, a three tiered structure for naming fora was established:

- Committee (Policy-level with co-ordinating functions)
- Working Group (Sectoral-level)
- Task Force (short-term, with specific terms of reference)

A couple of Taskforces use a different nomenclature although remain a Taskforce in status: the Gender Focal Point Network (GFPN) and the Electronic Commerce Steering Group (ECSG). Given their roles, this may be appropriate nomenclature but the issue can be considered further within the context of their independent assessments. Sub-fora continue to hold different names such as networks, and groups.

**Criteria for the establishment of new and extension of existing APEC Fora**

While recognizing the need to accommodate the ever-expanding nature of APEC work, there is also a clear directive from the Leaders to further streamline the APEC management process. Therefore, every effort should be made to incorporate new tasks into the work programs of existing APEC fora with approval of SOM. Where this is not feasible, a short-term task force may be established.

### *Task Forces*

- A task force is a short-term group under the auspices of either SOM or an existing APEC forum under the delegated authority of SOM.
- A task force is mandated for a maximum period of two years.

### *Working Group*

- A working group is a sectoral-level meeting under the auspices of either SOM or an existing APEC forum under the delegated authority of SOM.
- A working group has a medium to long-term agenda.
- A working group ToR will contain a review clause for a review at least every 4 years

### *Criteria for Establishment*

1. A proposal to establish new fora must specify the work to be undertaken resulting from instructions of APEC Economic Leaders or Ministers and explain why they cannot be dealt with by existing fora.
2. The establishment of new fora requires the approval of SOM by consensus.
3. A task force may be established to undertake a one-off specific task to report to the SCE or to undertake work in an area of interest to determine whether there is scope to develop a medium to long-term agenda that would benefit APEC economies.
  - A proposal to extend the term of a task force may be considered by SOM towards the end of its mandate. A report must be submitted to SOM outlining recommendations to support the extension of a task force, including a review of the ToR.
4. A working group may be established if it is determined that a medium to long-term agenda has been developed that would benefit APEC economies and is consistent with



priorities established by Leaders and Ministers.

5. Draft ToR for new fora must adhere to the guidelines detailed below.

### **Guidelines for the development of Terms of Reference for APEC Fora**

In 2006, the SCE recommended the Secretariat develop guidelines on ToR to ensure all SCE fora have relevant and targeted ToR. The ToR must reflect a clear strategic focus, establish policy criteria, clearly define goals and projected outputs, include a sunset clause, which identifies a timeline for review.

All new APEC fora are to submit their ToR to the SCE for endorsement. Any changes to the ToR of existing fora should also be submitted to the SCE for approval. The following guidelines have been developed to guide fora in developing ToR.

The ToR should include:

1. A statement of goals and objectives, which reflect a clear strategic focus;
2. Outline current priorities and projected outputs;
3. The structure of the group and working arrangements, including the rotation of the Chair (every two years), meeting arrangements (meetings schedules should be minimised and well-timed to ensure relevant participation and consistency with APEC processes), and reporting requirements (annual reporting through the SCE Fora Report or as requested by SOM);
4. Proposed cooperation/consultation with other APEC fora, the private sector, international financial institutions and other international organisations;
5. A sunset or review clause (after two year for task forces and four years for all other fora). The sunset clause should include a review of achievements against stated objectives and outputs, and consider whether the fora should continue to operate.

**ATTACHMENT 3****APEC Working Groups and Independent Assessments****Introduction**

In 2003-4, the SOM Committee on ECOTECH (ESC) assisted the Fisheries Working Group (FWG) successfully conduct an independent assessment of its implementation of ECOTECH activities. In November 2004, Ministers welcomed this exercise and encouraged the other working groups to undertake a similar review. In 2006, Ministers also welcomed the independent assessments of the Small and Medium Enterprises Working Group (SMEWG) and the Tourism Working Group (TWG), which pave the way for improving operations and responsiveness to meeting the Bogor Goals.

As part of recommendation 12 of the fora review, the SCE requested the Secretariat develop a program of independent assessments to evaluate all SCE working groups and taskforces and support periodic review processes, starting with those working groups identified in the review recommendations (Agricultural Technical Cooperation Working Group (ATCWG), the High level Policy Dialogue on Agriculture Biotechnology (HLPDAB), Marine Resource Conservation Working Group (MRCWG), and Gender Focal Point Network (GFPN).

BMC1 2007 approved the project proposal to undertake the 2007 Independent Assessments. As agreed by SOM, the APEC Secretariat will act as the project overseer for these projects on behalf of the SCE.

**Independent Assessment Schedule**

The proposed assessment schedule includes and assessment of three fora per year, which will enable each fora to be independently assessed every four years. The schedule is as follows:

2007	Marine Resource Conservation Working Group (MRCWG); Gender Focal Point Network (GFPN); Agriculture Technical Working Group (ATCWG) and the High level Policy Dialogue on Agriculture Biotechnology (HLPDAB)
2008	Human Resource Development Working Group (HRDWG); Energy Working Group (EWG); Anti-Corruption Taskforce (ACT); Fisheries Working Group (FWG)
2009	Industrial Science and Technology Working Group (ISTWG); Telecommunications and Information (TEL); the Electronic Commerce Steering Group (ECSG) (if it hasn't been amalgamated with another fora)
2010	Transportation Working Group (TPTWG); Counter-terrorism taskforce (CTTF); Health Taskforce (HTF);
2011	Taskforce on Emergency preparedness (TFEP); Small Medium Enterprise Working group (SMEWG); Marine Resource Conservation Working Group (MRCWG);
2012	Tourism Working Group (TWG), Gender Focal Point Network (GFPN); Agriculture Technical Working Group (ATCWG) and the High Level Policy Dialogue on Agriculture Biotechnology (HLPDAB); Anti-Corruption Taskforce (ACT)
2013	Fisheries Working Group (FWG); Human Resource Development Working Group (HRDWG); Energy Working Group (EWG);
2014 onwards	Continues in rotational manner

23 April 2007

**HTF BEYOND 2007****EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In 2003, the APEC Senior Officials created an *ad hoc* Health Task Force (HTF) to focus on natural and intentionally-caused health threats which could disrupt regional economies, trade and security. The HTF was originally given a two-year time-limited mandate which was extended in 2005.

Since its creation, the APEC HTF has been responsive to the directives of APEC Leaders, Ministers and Senior Officials, and has developed ambitious workplans to allow the region to quickly prepare for public health emergencies and address current public health challenges. Member economies have been very active in the HTF, both through strong participation at meetings and through delivering high quality projects and activities.

In 2006, the Steering Committee for ECOTECH (SCE) reviewed the relevance of all APEC sub-fora and provided this recommendation:

*The SCE recommends that further consideration be given to transforming the Health Task Force (HTF) to a Working Group during the review of its mandate in 2007.*

*Next steps: The HTF is requested to report back to the SCE on completion of its review.*

This paper serves as the HTF's response to this recommendation.

Health is and will remain a critical component of economic and trade development in the region and will remain so for the foreseeable future. APEC, as a regional forum, has provided a venue where the health concerns which affect economic development of member economies can be addressed, coupled with an organisational structure where Leaders can be informed quickly and effectively of emerging health threats and coordinated plans to address them.

To further enhance and contribute value to APEC and health issues, the HTF recommends that a Health Working Group (HWG) be established. Doing so will allow APEC to continue to address the complex health issues relating to economic development and cooperation by building on the linkages and deepening the understanding of the multi-sectoral impacts of health challenges, without duplicating the efforts of other organisations. By transforming the HTF into a Working Group, long-term and more complex projects are possible, and engagement with other APEC groups and international organisations can become more substantial. The Health Working Group will maintain a number of key organisational characteristics of the HTF to ensure that it continues to build on its effectiveness.

The Health Working Group's new mandate will build on the success of the Health Task Force in addressing health-related threats to economies, trade and security. The HWG will finalise and seek the endorsement for the HWG Terms of Reference in 2008. The Health Working Group could consider the following recommended areas of engagement:

- To further examine and address the links between health and economic development and cooperation

- To continue to strengthen APEC member economies' capacity to respond to public health emergencies and emerging public health issues
- To commit to broader and longer-term multi-sectoral cooperation and coordination between health experts and other sectoral experts

**Recommendation:**

The HTF has developed this paper together through a series of consultations. The HTF recommends that Senior Officials:

1. Transform the Health Task Force into a Health Working Group in January 2008.
2. Request that the HTF develop a draft Terms of Reference based on the SCE Guidelines which the Health Working Group will finalise and refer to Senior Officials for endorsement after its first meeting in 2008.
3. Encourage the active participation of relevant sectors from across APEC and APEC economies in the Health Working Group.

## BACKGROUND

The emergence of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in 2002-2003 and the highly-pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 in 2004 underscored to the Asia-Pacific region the major impact a public health emergency can have on individual economies and the collective, if the region is not better prepared to respond effectively.

In 2003, the APEC Senior Officials created an *ad hoc* Health Task Force (HTF) to focus on natural and intentionally caused health threats that would disrupt regional economies, trade and security. The current HTF mandate ends in December 2007. Over the last four years, the HTF had identified priorities such as avian and pandemic influenza; HIV/AIDS; and improving health outcomes through advances in health information technology.

The Steering Committee on ECOTECH (SCE) conducted a 2006 review of APEC working groups and task forces, including the HTF, and made recommendations to Senior Officials on establishing, merging, disbanding, or reorienting these bodies. The SCE consulted throughout the year with members and fora, examined information on terms of reference, meeting arrangements and project history and conducted a survey of views across economies and fora. Draft discussion papers were tabled at SCEII (2006/SOMII/SCE/012), SCEIII (2006/SOMIII/SCE/002) and distributed intersessionally; and a final outcome paper was tabled and discussed at SCEIV (2006/CSOM/SCE/001). The final paper's recommendation 11 states that:

*The SCE recommends that further consideration be given to transforming the Health Task Force (HTF) to a Working Group during the review of its mandate in 2007. Next steps: The HTF is requested to report back to the SCE on completion of its review.*

This paper serves as the HTF's response to this recommendation.

## HTF ACHIEVEMENTS

Over the course of its two mandates (2004-2005 and 2006-2007), the APEC HTF has been responsive to the directives of APEC Leaders, Ministers and Senior Officials. The HTF has consistently undertaken ambitious workplans to strengthen regional capacity to prepare for and respond to public health emergencies and address current public health challenges. These workplans have been successfully implemented, largely due to the active and continuous participation by member economies which have put forward projects and participated in the HTF meetings and initiatives.

APEC Leaders endorsed the *APEC Initiative on Preparing for and Mitigating an Influenza Pandemic* in November 2005. This *Initiative* identifies eleven areas for collective work by APEC economies. The HTF has responded, in just one year, to nine of the eleven items for collective action, through a variety of capacity-building workshops, sharing of information, and collective action. For example, the HTF assisted in improving the ability of economies to respond to public health concerns, and worked with economies to:

- strengthen domestic pandemic preparedness plans;
- promote information sharing and technical cooperation among economies;
- enhance regional communications networks and risk communications plans; and
- improve capacity to prevent and control avian influenza at its source.

The APEC *Action Plan on the Prevention and Response to Avian and Influenza Pandemics*, adopted in May 2006, builds on the 2005 Leaders' Initiative, by committing APEC economies to working individually and cooperatively to develop practical approaches to prevent, prepare for and mitigate the impact of avian influenza and a possible influenza pandemic. The HTF has committed to report to SOM in 2007 on its progress in meeting these commitments.

In November 2004, APEC Leader's adopted the "Fighting Against AIDS in APEC" initiative, in recognition that HIV/AIDS is a threat to the global economy and society as a whole, and committed APEC to fight HIV/AIDS regionally and globally. The Leader's also pledged their support to increase access to health care and to safe and affordable drugs for all people living with HIV/AIDS. There have also been a number of projects which have addressed HIV/AIDS issues in the workplace.

In 2003, the APEC Leaders Statement on Health Security and the SARS Action Plan mandated public health measures to prevent and respond to disease outbreaks. The HTF was instrumental in laying the groundwork for the region's provision of the health security measures outlined in these statements.

The HTF has regularly invited to its meetings representatives from other APEC fora, and international health-related institutions (WHO, UNAIDS, FAO/OIE, UN System Influenza Coordination) in order to promote cooperation and collaboration and to ensure that HTF activities were innovative and strategic.

The HTF has also been very successful at engaging the business sector in a number of projects that have private sector implications in all three HTF priority areas, for example:

- the "Functioning Economies in Times of Pandemic" project which will develop guidelines to ensure business continuity;
- the "Guidelines for Improving the Management of HIV/AIDS in the workplace" project which will help create an enabling environment for employers to implement effective workplace practices for people living with HIV;
- the "e-Health Initiative" project which will help research and development innovation in the Asia-Pacific as well as build capacity in e-health in APEC economies.

## RATIONALE FOR A HEALTH WORKING GROUP

Health remains a critical component of economic and trade development and cooperation in the region and will remain so for the foreseeable future. To further enhance and contribute value to APEC's responsiveness to health issues and their impacts, the HTF recommends that a Health Working Group be established. This will allow APEC to build on past successes in addressing the complex health issues relating to economic security and development.

The HTF was created with a time-limited mandate in order for it to demonstrate its value-added to APEC, the region, and to the international community. The HTF has, over the past four years, demonstrated this value-added through:

- a number of innovative projects which addressed the economic/trade dimensions of health issues;
- building the capacity of member economies to respond to emerging infectious diseases;
- assisting the region in preparing for public health emergencies.

These achievements have contributed to and have been complemented by the development of a community of APEC public health officials with strong linkages and partnerships with the emergency preparedness and animal health sectors. APEC has also engaged in several activities that have brought together senior public health, animal health, foreign affairs, and other sectors' officials, such as the 2006 APEC Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Avian and Pandemic Influenza.

APEC has a number of characteristics which provides it with a comparative advantage to respond to health issues. One of the most important characteristic is APEC's *ability to link health with trade, agriculture, the business community, and the economy*. This allows the forum to expertly address aspects of health issues that no other multilateral fora can, and allows APEC to contribute innovative solutions and approaches into the international community.

Due to its organisational structure, APEC fora can also readily *coordinate and collaborate across many sectors*. At any one Senior Officials and related meetings, the various groups can reach across their areas of unique focus and work together to advance issues of mutual concern. The HTF has been committed to working in this fashion, and has been able to collaborate with the business community and experts in the areas of emergency preparedness; agriculture; informatics and life science innovation. Being able to draw upon this vast array of expertise to discuss health issues, and how health in turn impacts their work, is unique.

A Health Working Group could also help facilitate *deeper and longer-term cooperation* with other APEC groups, regional and international health organisations. Investment by other organisations and APEC is difficult to develop when the status of the health group is temporary. A Working Group will allow long-term relationships to develop and help avoid duplication of effort.

A Health Working Group would also be better positioned to plan and engage in *longer-term work on more complex issues*. As a temporary task force, projects are forced to adopt a short-term perspective and it is difficult to address complex health issues in their entirety. Within a Health Working Group, APEC economies could invest in some longer-term projects that will be beneficial both to the region and the economies.

Given that the HTF has been able to demonstrate this unique value-added that APEC can provide to health issues, and given that the complex links between health and the economy/trade have only begun to be explored, there is value to consider making this a working group within APEC to ensure the important linkages created by the HTF continue. The HTF has been successful in meeting its mandate, but the range of possibilities for working on health within this forum has only recently begun to fully emerge. Member economies have stressed the benefit of continuing this work and ensuring that health issues are discussed and addressed in the context of trade and economic development in the region.

## **WORKING ARRANGEMENTS WITHIN APEC**

Many of the characteristics listed above that have contributed to the success of the HTF are organisational in nature: that is, the relationship of the Task Force within APEC has provided key linkages that the HTF considers important to maintain in a working group. Although the following will be further expanded in the Terms of Reference, it is important to note in this paper that the HTF agrees:

- to continue to hold Health Working Group meetings on the margins of Senior Official Meetings in order to maintain and deepen key linkages with other APEC fora;
- to continue to regularly report to Senior Officials on emerging health-related issues of importance throughout the APEC year;
- the HWG will not institute a regular Health Ministers Meeting, unless an emerging issue that demands Ministerial attention has been identified by the Working Group.

The HTF understands that due to the current reform process underway in APEC, all working groups will be subject to an independent review every four years to demonstrate ongoing relevance and responsiveness to APEC's current work priorities. The HTF (or its successor) is currently slated for a review in 2010.

## **PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF A POSSIBLE NEW MANDATE AND SUGGESTED PRIORITIES**

The current mandate of the HTF is to address health-related threats to economies, trade and security, focussing mainly on emerging infectious diseases, including naturally-occurring and deliberately caused infectious diseases. The HTF focused on a limited number of areas which could produce tangible results within its two year mandates, as well as respond to specific Leaders directives. As a Working Group, it will be important to continue to identify areas of cooperation and capacity building that can be achieved, or substantially initiated, within this timeframe to ensure continued productivity and relevance of the HWG's workplan.

The HTF Terms of Reference (2004/SOMI/006rev3) is still largely relevant to a Health Working Group as there are many issues that have either not been developed or need to be more fully addressed.

### **Suggested New Mandate and Priorities**

The new Health Working Group will continue to identify opportunities to improve health security and prosperity in the region. In order to achieve this, the new HWG should take a leadership and coordinating role, as the expert group on health issues in APEC. Any activities



that will be carried out through a new HWG should continue to relate to APEC core areas, particularly economic and technical cooperation.

The new Health Working Group could engage in longer-term work on more complex issues that APEC would be a natural forum to address. Key aspects that APEC economies are well positioned to address includes focusing on diseases that disproportionately affect developing countries in the Asia-Pacific region, and to propose strategies that promote public health priorities. APEC could also address several health issues beyond infectious disease control that have trans-boundary effects and are linked to the economy; and it could continue to develop as a policy think-tank that works across sectors. In addition it is important to continue to encourage the participation of officials from outside the public health ministries, including labour, trade, agriculture and finance, as well as the private sector, to identify ways in which APEC can work to mitigate economic effects, promote better workforce policies (continuity of operations as well as labour issues), and discuss ways in which governments can improve the capacity to respond to the economic consequences of health challenges.

Other potential priorities which have only begun to be addressed, and where there is considerable merit to continue this work in APEC might include:

- broader and longer-term coordination, especially between animal and human health experts, to reduce the risk of the emergence of other zoonotic diseases;
- improving awareness of and capacity to implement international regulations and recommendations, such as the International Health Regulations;
- improving cooperation and capacity of economies to promote international trade and the continued movement of people and goods, as appropriate, in the event of a health emergency;
- business continuity and the maintenance of basic infrastructure and services during a public health emergency;
- enhancing human resources and information communication related to health emergencies;
- building a regular communication network mechanism for exchanging up-to-date information on health-related issues;
- building cooperation on strengthening the health care system;
- strengthening public health capacity: Members could collaborate to strengthen regional and national capacities for public health surveillance and response as well as epidemic preparedness in an effort to minimise morbidity, mortality and economic loss;
- assessing the economic impacts of non-communicable diseases/lifestyle diseases;
- examining the links between health, the environment and economic development by examining the economic impact of emerging and re-emerging zoonotic diseases, pollution and water quality as a result of changes in the environment.

In order to operationalise these priorities and continue to advance APEC health issues, the proposed new Working Group will need to focus on several areas, including:

- Considering and refining the draft Terms of Reference, based on the SCE Guidelines, that the HTF will develop in 2007 for the Health Working Group;
- Developing a medium-term strategic plan with achievable goals, objectives, priorities, timelines, outputs and reporting and evaluation processes;
- Identifying ways in which linkages and relationships can continue to be built between economies. This is particularly relevant with pandemics and emerging infectious diseases which cross national borders.