

**Summary Conclusions of the
First APEC Budget and Management Committee Meeting
Clark, Philippines
3 February 2015**

Introduction

1. The APEC Budget and Management Committee (BMC) held its first meeting for 2015 in Clark, the Philippines on 3 February 2015. 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; the Philippines; Russia; Singapore; Chinese Taipei; Thailand; the United States; Viet Nam and the APEC Secretariat. The list of participants is at [2015/SOM1/BMC/PL](#).
2. The meeting was chaired by Mr ZHOU Ningyu, Deputy Director from the Department of International Economic Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China.

Agenda Item 1: Chair's Opening Remarks

3. The Chair welcomed BMC colleagues and representatives of the APEC Secretariat to the meeting and thanked the host, the Philippines, for their hospitality. He also introduced the BMC Vice-Chair, Ms Millicent C. Paredes, from the Department of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of Agenda

4. The meeting adopted the agenda ([2015/SOM1/BMC/001](#)) without amendments.

Agenda Item 3: Remarks by the Executive Director

5. The Executive Director briefed BMC on the Secretariat's Operational Plan for 2015 to be presented to the First Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM), and the latest development of the social media and partnership tender as approved by BMC intersessionally in last December. He undertook to further update BMC intersessionally on the result of the tender process for a final decision on the contract award, taking into account the desirability of the outsourced contractor to provide a point of contact with the Secretariat in Singapore as indicated by some BMC members.

Agenda Item 4: APEC 2015 Priorities

6. The Vice-Chair welcomed members to the Philippines and introduced the 2015 theme "Building Inclusive Economies, Building a Better World" and key priorities, as follows:
 - (a) Enhancing the regional economic integration agenda;
 - (b) Fostering SMEs' participation in regional and global markets;
 - (c) Investing in human capital development; and
 - (d) Building sustainable and resilient communities.
7. The Chair invited members to note and support the 2015 APEC priorities, particularly through financing projects.

Agenda Item 5: BMC 2015 Work Plan

8. The Chair introduced the proposed 2015 BMC Work Plan which sought to take forward the priorities identified by Senior Officials for 2015, including the tasks carried forward from the APEC 2014 Tasking Statement. He remarked that BMC would also continue this year to progress its substantial work program on the overall APEC funding position, the budgetary and financial processes of the Secretariat, and the implementation of key project management reforms.
9. The meeting endorsed the 2015 BMC Work Plan ([2015/SOM1/BMC/002](#)).

Agenda Item 6: Project Management

6.1 Project Management Unit Update Report

10. Director (Project Management Unit (PMU)) introduced the PMU report as set out in 2015/SOM1/BMC/003 and invited members to note the updates provided.
11. The Chair highlighted that the PMU had a substantial work programme following the previous discussions of BMC. Regarding BMC's request at the last meeting for the Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy (PPWE) to work with the PMU to update the guide on gender criteria for APEC project proposals, he was prepared to follow this up by writing to the PPWE Chair, as proposed by the PMU and in his capacity of the BMC Chair, subject to the views of members.
12. United States expressed support to the proposed follow-up action, highlighting that their representatives in the PPWE understood that its new Chair from the Philippines was very aware of BMC's request and was ready to work with the PPWE on it.
13. The Vice-Chair remarked that the Philippines supported the reiteration of BMC's request to the PPWE, which would be welcomed by the new PPWE Chair.
14. There being no other comments, the meeting noted the PMU update report, and agreed that the BMC Chair write to the PPWE Chair to propose that the guide be updated.

6.2 Extended 2013 Projects

6.3 Financial Reports for APEC-funded Projects

15. Director (PMU) presented to the meeting the two information papers 2015/SOM1/BMC/004 and 2015/SOM1/BMC/005. There being no comments or questions, the meeting noted the project extensions and contract waivers granted by the Secretariat in 2014 and the latest spending position of the APEC-funded projects.

6.4 Project Management Reforms

(i) Review of the Pilot Phase of Multi-year Projects (MYPs) – Outcomes

16. Ms Nadira Mailewa, the independent consultant engaged by the Secretariat as agreed by BMC, presented the review findings and recommendations to the meeting.
17. Some members expressed views with respect to the review findings, as follows –
 - (a) Chinese Taipei enquired whether and how MYPs could be linked to the APEC priorities of different host economies each year. In response, Ms Mailewa indicated that MYPs were designed to be more high level and strategic, and the findings of the review survey confirmed clear evidence of relevance between the MYPs and APEC strategic priorities. Director (PMU) supplemented that MYPs were still in pilot phase and the selection process of further MYP proposals would be subject to study when a decision was to be made on the future of MYPs.
 - (b) Australia indicated that whether APEC should embrace MYPs after the pilot phase and its capacity to do so would be the crux of the issue. From the project effectiveness perspective, they considered MYPs sensible as APEC was dealing with issues such as policy developments and system reforms which required an incremental and organic approach to develop the next step based on achievements. In this connection, further consideration should be given to whether there would be merit in having a designated bucket of money for MYPs to provide certainty for their development over several years.
 - (c) United States shared their experience of US-ATARRI with the meeting that, operational-wise, their self-funded capacity building projects in APEC all had five year plans, which were living documents for updating on a yearly basis and for tracing the impact of the projects. They considered that the subject of MYPs needed to be further revisited and would like to

suggest reconvening the BMC Small Working Group on Effectiveness to continue the discussion.

- (d) China remarked that further study on the future of MYPs would be required, especially with regard to the availability and sustainability of project funding to support this longer term and multi-year initiative.
 - (e) Peru highlighted that as the APEC host next year, they would continue the Philippines' efforts in various priorities of this year, but APEC's capacity in economic and technical cooperation had been weakened by the diminishing voluntary funding for projects. They encouraged economies to continue to address this budget issue, and BMC to participate in SCE's discussions on the capacity building policy and the project approval mechanism.
18. Ms Mailewa responded that the scope of this review of the pilot phase of MYPs was limited to its operational aspects, but she agreed with members that there were a range of higher level issues that had to be addressed in order to decide on the future of MYPs beyond the pilot phase. She was excused from the meeting at this juncture.
19. Director (PMU) presented to the meeting the proposed management response to the review recommendations. In particular, he highlighted that although the last pilot MYP was scheduled for completion until end 2018, the Secretariat proposed that an evaluation of the effectiveness of MYPs be undertaken once 75% of the pilot projects had been completed, i.e. December 2016 according to the latest schedule. This could form a basis for a decision on the future of MYPs.
20. Some members expressed views with respect to the proposed management response, as follows –
- (a) Chile expressed support for the proposed timing for the MYP evaluation, but would like to explore whether the Secretariat would accept the submission of concept notes of MYPs for the time being and how APEC project funding cap would be applied to the future MYPs.
 - (b) Australia remarked that they saw real merit in having longer term APEC projects and for BMC to fund them, provided that the nature of the issues that needed to be tackled required several years for the project activities to be developed and rolled out. They considered that it might not be in APEC's interest if MYPs were to be frozen simply because of operational needs. Hence, Australia would like to clarify whether the factors of consideration in the MYP evaluation would be mainly driven by the availability and sustainability of funding (recommendation 13) and effectively looking from the operational point of view.
21. In response, Director (PMU) said that as agreed by BMC, the pilot phase of MYPs was concluded in June 2013 with a total of 12 projects. Whether further MYPs would be approved and, if so, their funding cap, would be subject to the outcome of the MYP evaluation and BMC's decision. In the MYP evaluation, the main drive would be an assessment of whether MYPs were effective, achieving their objectives and contributing to APEC priorities (recommendation 1), but not so much on funding or operational issues. If a decision was to continue with MYPs because they were proven to be effective, then the funding consideration (recommendations 13 and 14) would come in, with an aim to support their future implementation.
22. There being no other comments, BMC endorsed the final report and recommendations of the MYP pilot mid-term review at Annex 2 to 2015/SOM1/BMC/006, and agreed to the management response at Annex 3 that would be implemented by the Secretariat, including changes in the administration of the pilot MYPs to improve their management. An evaluation would be commenced at the end of 2016 for a decision on the future of MYPs.
23. On behalf of BMC, the Chair thanked Australia for funding the MYP pilot mid-term review through its Effectiveness Grant to the Secretariat, and members of the BMC Small Working Group on Effectiveness for their assistance in overseeing the preparation of the review report.

(ii) Long Term Evaluations of APEC Projects – An Update

24. Director (PMU) informed the meeting that implementation of the Framework for Long-Term Evaluation of APEC projects, which BMC approved in 2013, was largely complete. Subject to available funding, the Secretariat would seek to start conducting the evaluations from the second half of 2015.
25. There being no comments or questions, the meeting noted the progress achieved in implementing the approved framework and the proposed next steps outlined in 2015/SOM1/BMC/007.

(iii) Inclusion of Capacity Building Guidelines in Project Development Materials

26. The Chair indicated that the 2014 SCE Chair had sent a letter to the 2014 BMC Chair (Annex 1 to 2015/SOM1/BMC/008), requesting BMC to consider incorporating a set of capacity building guidelines developed by SCE last year into its project development materials. He invited members to consider the request, as well as the SCE Chair's invitation that BMC members be involved in the development of the capacity building policy in 2015.
27. Members' views expressed at the meeting are summarized as follows –

Capacity Building Guidelines

- (a) Australia remarked that the capacity building guidelines referred to five areas which represented a project cycle in a way different from the Guidebook on APEC Projects (the Guidebook). They enquired how the capacity building guidelines could be incorporated into what already existed in the Guidebook in practical terms, noting that the guidelines might serve the purpose of a snapshot of project implementation and management to help economies quickly realize the steps that they needed to go through before going to the Guidebook for details. In response, Director (PMU) said that the capacity building guidelines were a formal document provided by SCE, and including them as an annex in the Guidebook would be the most consistent approach to what SCE had agreed to.
- (b) Russia expressed support for the SCE Chair's request, on the understanding that projects initiated under the APEC Support Fund were mainly aimed at addressing the capacity building needs of APEC developing economies, and incorporating the capacity building guidelines into project materials would, to some extent, help increase the quality of projects.

Development of Capacity Building Policy

- (c) Peru remarked that as the SCE Chair of 2015 and the APEC host economy of 2016, they would support the adoption of all of the three options proposed by the Secretariat in paragraph 10 of the paper with respect to how BMC members could be involved in the development of the capacity building policy this year.
- (d) China expressed support for Peru's proposal, highlighting that the key was to enable BMC to have frequent and good interaction with SCE throughout the year and in the long term to support SCE's work and priorities.
- (e) Chile echoed the views of other members and expressed support to the next steps proposed in response to SCE's request and invitation.
- (f) Australia also agreed with other members' views. They remarked that it would be critical that the issues raised and the policy to be established by SCE would be fed into the practical system overseen by BMC, but efforts should be focused on simplifying the existing tools and using them more effectively instead of developing more tools and guides in this process.
28. There being no other comments, the Chair concluded that BMC agreed to incorporate into its project management materials the capacity building guidelines developed by SCE in 2014; and that BMC resolved to actively contribute to the development by SCE of a capacity building policy in 2015.

(iv) Updates to Guidebook on APEC Projects

29. Director (PMU) introduced the proposed updates to the Guidebook, including amendments to incorporate a variety of BMC decisions in 2014, and those discussed in agenda item 6.4(ii) on the evaluation framework for APEC projects and agenda item 6.4(iii) on the addition of SCE's capacity building guidelines as a new annex. In response to Chile's enquiry, he remarked that the updated version of the Guidebook would come into effect from project session 1 this year, but the main changes had been well communicated through various channels to project overseers who wished to submit concept notes for session 1.
30. There being no other comments, the meeting approved the proposed changes to the Guidebook as set out in 2015/SOM1/BMC/009.

Agenda Item 7: Project Funding

7.1 2015 Aspirational Target for Voluntary Contributions and Annual Allocation from Reserve

31. The Chair highlighted that the two documents developed by BMC last year to address the APEC funding concern, i.e. the Modus Operandi for Coordinating Voluntary Contributions from Member Economies for APEC Projects (the modus operandi) and the Protocol on the Management of APEC Project Funding, had been endorsed by Ministers at the AMM held in last November. As another measure to strengthen the untied funding for APEC projects, BMC and SOM had also approved last year to put in place a mechanism to transfer the Secretariat Account reserve to the General Project Account (GPA) to maintain its level of funding available for project approvals at USD 1.95 million per year. All these were in place for implementation from January 2015.
32. Director (Finance) presented the paper 2015/SOM1/BMC/010, including the computation of the 2015 aspirational target for voluntary contributions at USD 4.2 million in accordance with the modus operandi, and the proposed allocation of USD 525,400 from the Secretariat Account reserve to the GPA in 2015 based on the approve mechanism for BMC's endorsement. She also informed the meeting that two economies, Australia and Russia, had confirmed funding commitments of about USD 2.2 million in total towards the APEC Support Fund (ASF) General Fund in 2015, and that the remaining balance of voluntary contributions required to meet the 2015 aspirational target was USD 2 million.
33. There being no comments or questions, BMC endorsed the 2015 aspirational target for untied voluntary contributions, i.e. USD 4.2 million, for approval by SOM, and also approved to allocate USD 525,400 from the Secretariat Account reserve to the GPA in 2015.

7.2 New Sub-fund on Mining under APEC Support Fund

34. Australia introduced their information paper 2015/SOM1/BMC/011, presenting to the meeting the background of the establishment of a new ASF sub-fund on mining following Leaders' intention and Senior Officials' decision last year, and its overall governance arrangements proposed by Australia. Australia would contribute AUD 1.2 million for setting up this sub-fund, which would enable project proposals to start to be processed once the funding criteria were agreed by the Mining Task Force (MTF). They were also looking at the possibility of holding a workshop in the margins of the next MTF meeting to help MTF members better understand the process and the governance arrangements for accessing funds under this sub-fund.
35. China welcomed the paper from Australia and the establishment of this new ASF sub-fund to follow up the outcome of APEC in 2014, and to help address the funding issue of mining related activities which had not been accorded a rank 1 priority for years.
36. Chile, as the Chair of MTF, thanked Australia for establishing this mining sub-fund, highlighting that the implementation of mining related projects was one of the key issues brought up at the Mining Ministerial Meeting held in Beijing, China last year.
37. The Chair remarked that the new ASF mining sub-fund would play an important role in meeting the capacity building needs of member economies in the policy area of mining. He expressed appreciation, on behalf of BMC, for Australia's efforts in establishing this sub-fund.

7.3 China's Plan on Voluntary Contribution and Related Considerations

38. China introduced their information paper 2015/SOM1/BMC/012, briefing the meeting on the commitment of China, as the host economy of 2014, to contribute USD 10 million to APEC, with a view to progressing the APEC priorities of last year effectively and helping meet the capacity building needs of member economies. On the utilisation of this contribution, China aimed to present their proposal to establish three new ASF sub-funds in respect of last year's priority areas to SOM2 for approval. Further details of their contribution, including arrangements on the new sub-funds and the funding allocation in response to 2015 aspirational target for voluntary contributions, would be finalised and come into effect by the end of this year. China welcomed views from members on their plan on voluntary contribution to APEC.
39. Australia; Chile; Hong Kong, China; Indonesia; Peru and Russia welcomed and expressed appreciation for China's contribution to APEC, highlighting that it was an important step in terms of supporting and following through the commitments of Leaders and Ministers, as well as long-term plans of APEC, with tangible and targeted activities. Some members also remarked that an early indication from China on the actual allocation of the USD 10 million contribution for the various uses would be helpful and appreciated.
40. The Executive Director remarked that he was pleased to hear how President Xi's announcement of funding contribution to APEC was being operationalized, and the Secretariat would be very pleased to assist on that. In response to Peru's comments about the depletion of APEC project funds and their legal impediments to contribute project funding voluntarily to APEC, the Executive Director said that any suggestions to facilitate member economies to contribute to the aspirational target would continue to be welcomed.
41. In response to some members' enquiries, Director (Finance) supplemented that the Secretariat would provide to BMC2 an updated position of voluntary funding commitments of member economies vis-à-vis the 2015 aspirational target, and a forecast of untied project funding available in the next three years for members' information and report to SOM3.
42. The Chair concluded that there was general support among members for China's plan on voluntary contribution to APEC. He expressed the wish that the inter-sessional work of China for operationalizing the plan, including the establishment of the new ASF sub-funds, would be conducted smoothly to support APEC's agenda as soon as possible.

Agenda Item 8: Other Business

8.1 APEC Members' Contributions

43. Japan introduced their discussion paper 2015/SOM1/BMC/013 co-sponsored by Canada and the Philippines, proposing to start updating APEC members' contributions using the latest economic data since the current APEC members' contributions were based on the GNP data back in 1994-1996. Japan emphasized that there was no intention to change the formula since its last agreement in 1998. They were aware that member economies might need more time to consider this matter, and therefore would be flexible about their tentative schedule of completing discussions this year for implementation in 2016. Japan specified that their proposal was to seek BMC's agreement to start a discussion to update the APEC members' contributions.
44. The meeting then had a lengthy discussion on this subject, and members' views are summarized as follows –
 - (a) Canada welcomed Japan's proposal to review APEC members' contributions, highlighting that it would help update the balance of contribution assessments among economies to make it more reflective of the latest economic realities and bring it more aligned with those of the United Nations (UN).
 - (b) China did not support the proposal, highlighting that the existing basis of APEC members' contributions had been effective and balanced for many years; and that conducting a review on this would be very complicated and time consuming, which would divert the attention of member economies from APEC priorities.

- (c) Indonesia queried about the main objective or purpose of the proposal, e.g. whether it was aimed at re-distributing the share of members' contributions among economies, or addressing the concern with respect to the depletion of APEC funding for an increasing number of project proposals.
 - (d) Peru queried whether the proposal aimed to simply update the GNP data based on the existing formula structure, or to change the methodology of the agreed formula. If the proposal involved a change in methodology or an increase in their budget requirements, Peru would have serious concerns as a matter of principle.
 - (e) Russia did not support the proposal to conduct a review on APEC members' contribution at this moment. They highlighted that the GNP data of 2011-13 also could not reflect the latest real economic situation among member economies due to the world financial crisis a few years back.
 - (f) Singapore reiterated that the existing members' contribution formula was the result of political compromise in 1998, and that no consensus could be reached among economies in previous discussions on the same subject in 2004-07 and 2009. They highlighted that the political compromise back then was delicate given the maximum share of 18% by the two Category 1 economies in effect required other economies to pay more in their members' contributions to make up for the differences arising from that ceiling. Noting Canada's reference to the UN Scale of Assessments, Singapore highlighted that those discussions at the UN, including its ceiling, had been highly sensitive and contentious. They added that the G77, which several APEC members belonged to, had a strong position on members' contributions at the UN, including on the ceiling, which is enshrined in several past Ministerial declarations, including in 2014.¹ Similarly, any review on the APEC members' contributions would unavoidably involve discussions on all elements of the existing formula, including the ceiling of 18% for Category 1 economies, which would be very complicated. Singapore highlighted that past experience showed that these reviews tended to make progress under exceptional circumstances, such as when there was a change in the number of APEC members. In this connection, APEC should adopt a more pragmatic approach and focus its energies on its priorities as suggested by China.
 - (g) United States remarked that the ceiling in the existing APEC members' contribution formula was a significant issue to them, and they would have concerns if the proposed review or discussion would mean a readjustment of the formula methodology and have implications on the ceiling.
 - (h) Brunei echoed the views of China and Singapore, and suggested that it was not a good time to re-open discussions on reviewing APEC members' contribution. They also highlighted that, as a developing economy, Brunei would be very prudent in approaching and considering this matter.
 - (i) Chinese Taipei considered that there was no consensus among member economies on Japan's proposal, and they did not wish to engage in further substantial discussions on this topic. They also cautioned that any major changes in members' contribution might discourage economies from considering making voluntary contributions to APEC.
45. In response to members' enquiries, Japan clarified that their proposal only aimed to seek an update on the share of members' contributions and the category grouping of member economies based on the latest GNP data to correspond to the latest economic situation among economies. They did not intend to change the methodology of the existing contribution formula, including the ceiling, or the overall APEC members' contribution level. Other technical issues, such as the appropriate set of economic data to be adopted for the update, could be further discussed once BMC agreed to start discussions for this review.

¹ Paragraph 81, extracted as follows: "*The Ministers stressed that the current maximum assessment rate, or ceiling, had been fixed as a political compromise and is contrary to the principle of the capacity to pay and is a fundamental source of distortion in the scale of assessments.*"

46. In response to Singapore's request for advice from the Secretariat about how the latest GNP data might be applied to the existing formula without changing its methodology as suggested by Japan, Director (Finance) provided factual information to the meeting that based on the existing formula approved by Ministers in 1998, the shares of members' contributions of economies in Category 1, Category 3 and Category 4 were fixed at 18%, 2.75% and 1.5% respectively; and the remaining seven economies in Category 2 were supposed to share the rest amount of contributions according to their GNP and GNP per capita figures. There was also no agreed arrangement in APEC to change the existing category grouping of member economies.
47. China further remarked that the existing formula was a political compromise and an agreed package of APEC as a whole. They considered it illogical and inappropriate to discuss a proposal affecting only selected member economies, and that there were no immediate or imminent needs to engage APEC in such difficult and time-consuming debate.
48. There being no other comments, the Chair concluded that BMC appreciated Japan's proposal and their clarifications on other economies' queries on issues such as the implications on the overall members' contribution level and the existing contribution methodology. Several economies expressed concerns on this matter, emphasising that the current methodology was a delicate political compromise and balance, and that any proposed changes to the existing share of members' contribution or the current contribution methodology would lead to difficult negotiations and divert our resources and attention from APEC priorities. BMC concluded that there was no consensus reached at the meeting on Japan's proposal.

8.2 Guidelines for Hosting APEC Meetings

49. The Executive Director informed the meeting that since the last update on the Guidelines for Hosting APEC Meetings approved by SOM1, 2014, the Secretariat had further updated one section of the Guidelines on equipment, i.e. section 9.6.2, to provide more comprehensive guidance to APEC hosts on how information technology requirements for hosting might be met desirably from the technical point of view. In response to Papua New Guinea's enquiry, the Executive Director supplemented that the Guidelines applied to all types of APEC meetings, and the technical additions in this update were only meant to provide suggestions or recommendations to hosting economies for consideration.
50. Canada remarked that APEC should take advantage more of remote participation. They suggested canvassing people who could potentially remotely participate in APEC meetings by giving them a particular topic in which they had a keen interest, and then ordering the agenda in a way that would align with their time zones.
51. The Executive Director thanked Canada for the suggestion. He said that some sub-fora, e.g. the Telecommunications and Information Working Group, had been doing this on a case-by-case basis, and it would continue to be up to individual fora/sub-fora and their Chair to decide whether and, if so, how to implement this.
52. There being no other comments, the meeting noted the updated set of Guidelines for Hosting APEC Meetings (2015/SOM1/BMC/015) that would be submitted to SOM1 for approval.

8.3 APEC Funding Criteria for 2015

53. The Chair remarked that this agenda item was proposed by Canada for discussion at this meeting. By way of background, the issue of funding criteria had been raised at ISOM in Manila in last December, highlighting that there was a risk that Rank 2 and 3 projects had very little chance of receiving project funding, especially given the decrease in available funds. The SOM Chair's Office had recently circulated a paper on "APEC Funding Criteria" for further discussion by Senior Officials at SOM1. The paper sought to task BMC to review the application of the APEC funding criteria to project selection and approval, and to report to SOM3 on any recommended modifications to improve the current funding mechanism. BMC Members were invited to form a view on how to respond to Senior Officials' request and take forward this matter.

54. Canada indicated that the pilot of scoring system for selecting projects would be put in place in project session 1 of this year. They suggested that BMC proceed with this pilot project first, with a view to conducting an evaluation on its outcomes and considering any required modifications to the scoring template, e.g. the weighting to different funding criteria, for SOM's consideration. Canada would be pleased to work with the Secretariat to put together some ideas for intersessional consultation with member economies and BMC's discussion at the next meeting.
55. The Vice-Chair highlighted that the SOM1 paper was just meant to facilitate Senior Officials to continue their discussion with respect to the funding criteria concern, and the outcome of the pilot of scoring system for selecting projects to be conducted in project session 1 would certainly help inform BMC and SOM of alternative options for further consideration and decision.
56. There being no other comments, the Chair concluded that BMC, in close coordination with member economies and the Secretariat, would continue its intersessional work to review, and consider improvements to, the application of the APEC funding criteria to project selection and approval, taking into consideration the outcomes of the pilot in project session 1 of this year. BMC would discuss any recommended modifications at the next meeting for report to SOM3.

8.4 BMC Meeting Calendar in 2014

57. The Vice-Chair said that BMC2 would be held in the margins of SOM3 (end August to early September 2015) in Cebu, Philippines. The date would be decided in consultation with the Chair and the Secretariat in due course.

Agenda item 9: Classification of Documents

58. The meeting approved and the classification list 2015/SOM1/BMC/000.

Closing

59. The Chair thanked the Philippines for the warm hospitality and members for their constructive discussions. He also expressed appreciation for the work of the Secretariat led by the Executive Director.
60. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**APEC Secretariat
April 2015**