

**ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION (APEC)
POLICY PARTNERSHIP ON FOOD SECURITY (PPFS) MEETING**

October 2-3, 2015
Iloilo Convention Center (ICC), Iloilo City

Meeting Report

Session I - Opening Session

A. Welcome Remarks

1. Atty. Asis Perez, the PPFS Chair, welcomed the delegates and guests to the meeting. He thanked the economies and resource persons for attending the meeting to take part in the dialogue that signifies their commitment towards addressing food security, which is among the most challenging issues in APEC economies.
2. He cited the APEC definition of food security which goes beyond food production where the goal is to build inclusive growth among all sectors. He shared common insights to include smallholders in the food value chain and convergence with the public sector. He also called for the need for linkages between and among economies to advance food systems.
3. He also shared that the Philippines is experiencing El Nino phenomenon, and proposed for PPFS to discuss the matter, and looked forward for high level of support for the new action plan in the area of knowledge sharing and best practices. He hoped that the action plan formulated in Boracay would result in tangible recommendations. Finally he hoped for a fruitful discussion.

B. Remarks from PPFS Vice Chair (China)

4. Dr. Han Jizhi, Vice Chair from China thanked the Philippines for the wonderful reception. He informed that 2015 is the last year in attaining the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and first year of the 2030 Zero Hunger Challenge of UN.
5. He acknowledged the efforts made by the PPFS economies towards attaining the food security theme, particularly reducing food loss and food waste at all levels and cited the projects led by Chinese Taipei, the United States, China and Japan. He added that through these activities, APEC was able to raise awareness and disseminate knowledge on how to address these challenge.

6. He shared that APEC has achieved the largest reduction of undernourished people, but still there is still a large number of people suffering from the member economies. He then called for an inclusive growth to include livelihood, enhancement of productivity of resources among small holders, and promotion of wider market integration. He encouraged economies to work towards an inclusive growth to increase the income of the poor and small holder farmers. He also expressed that a mix of technology and policy innovation is needed to address malnutrition, among others.

C. PPFS Vice Chair (Peru)

7. The Vice Chair from Peru expressed appreciation to be in Iloilo as an important area for attaining food security in the Philippines. She stated that Peru intends to follow the identified priority issues by the Philippines on their 2016 hosting. She also cited that Peru is facing El Nino which is the reason why the proposed first meeting of PPFS will be held in May instead of February, and also in 2nd meeting in September. She also hoped for a successful meeting and look forward to strengthening the PPFS and look forward to follow in the steps that were identified in the Philippines for their hosting next year.

D. PPFS Vice Chair (ABAC)

8. Mr. Anthony Nowell thanked the Philippines for the arrangements. He acknowledged the growth in Philippine economy and hoped for the same in all economies throughout the APEC region. He welcomed the public and private sector colleagues and noted that there would be a robust agenda for the following two days. He noted that PPFS was starting to develop some real momentum.
9. He shared that he had just come from a meeting of the Asia Pacific Food Industry Forum (APFIF). The well-attended meeting had identified high levels of interest on issues of food trade and how to deliver food security most effectively, particularly in relation to market access barriers (including tariffs and non-tariff issues) and technology issues including biotechnology and genetic engineering, which was an area that merited further debate. He cautioned that global food security continued to face challenges including climate change and turmoil in commodity markets. He looked forward to robust discussions. He also expected strong proposals for recommendations to economic leaders.

E. PPFS Program Director of APEC Secretariat

10. Mr. Pruthipong Poonthrigobol expressed sincere appreciation to the office of the Chair and the support of the DA for the wonderful hosting of this meeting. He emphasized the importance of the work of PPFS on ensuring food security for a sustainable food system in APEC.
11. He reminded the economies that this year, the Philippines focused on inclusive growth and that APEC Secretariat will continue to support the work of the group. He also informed the participants of the prior meetings conducted during the Food security week.
12. He looked forward to an interactive discussion and participation of delegates and a successful meeting.

F. Introduction of Delegation Leads

13. Each economy was requested to introduce its delegation to the meeting. Member economies present were as follows: Australia, Canada, Chile, People's Republic of China, Hong Kong China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Singapore, Chinese Taipei, Thailand, the United States, and Viet Nam.
14. Aside from member economies and OFWG Liaison to PPFS, representatives of ATCWG, HLPDAB, FSCF, ABAC and UNESCAP were also present in the meeting.

G. Appointment of Rapporteur

15. The Chair volunteered the Philippine Secretariat to be rapporteur of the meeting.

H. Formation of Drafting Committee

16. A drafting committee was also created to assist the Chair in drafting the Summary Report for the HLPD and to the leaders. The following economies expressed willingness to be part of the drafting committee- China, Chinese Taipei, Philippines, the United States, Japan, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Russia, and ABAC.

I. Adoption of the Agenda

17. The ABAC Vice Chair proposed for the acceptance of the agenda, which was seconded by the United States.

Session 2: Progress Report of PPFS 2015

A. Overview and Updates of Outcomes/Summary of PPFS 2015 Meeting and Management Council (MC) Meeting in Boracay

18. The Chair presented the agreements made during the last PPFS meeting and highlighted the identified priority areas for PPFS 2015 of the four working groups, as well as the preliminary views and ideas raised on the PPFS 2015 Workplan, which took off from existing and previously adopted documents.
19. He reminded the participants that there is still a need to translate priority areas into policy statements.

B. Overview and Updates of Inter-sessionally endorsed actions/documents during the PPFS Meeting in Boracay and other relevant developments in PPFS

20. The APEC Secretariat informed the PPFS that the draft PPFS 2015 workplan was endorsed inter-sessionally. He shared the meetings and activities undertaken: The US, in collaboration with Philippines and Mexico, hosted HLPDAB workshop on plant breeding in Manila in June 2015; The Philippines held a workshop on planning collaborative research and development program on climate change (Manila, September 2015), ATCWG Seminar on Reducing Food Losses in the Supply chains of Fisheries and Livestock by Chinese Taipei in collaboration with New Zealand and Philippines; and Private Sector led Forum on Global Alliances on Biotech, on 30 September in Iloilo City, Philippines.
21. He also reported on the results of APEC Concept Notes proposal session 2/2015 and informed that one PPFS Concept Note from Viet Nam was successful. It is the first PPFS project proposal that was funded. He congratulated Viet Nam, and encouraged more submissions from economies in the next session of concept note proposals which is usually held in February or March of each year. He then assured the economies that they will be informed once the schedules and timelines are finalized.

Session III: Information Sharing

A. Information Sharing by APEC Economies

22. The Chair invited the PPFS Member Economies to share their respective in-country initiatives involving private sector participation and progress of work pertaining to PPFS and Food Security relative to the 2015 PPFS Theme "Building Inclusive Growth in Agriculture & Fisheries Sector to Ensure Food Security". Among others, the following economies reported their in-country initiatives and progress:

- a. Australia- shared new innovative partnerships with PS in relation to achieving food security, multi economy activity and investments, recent investment on funding agribusiness activities at the regional forum, multi stakeholder forum reaching small holder farmers, facilitated business partnerships with other countries; women economic empowerment whereby female farmers have access to resources to increase farm yield; recognize joining forces with private sector for an increased success rate
- Canada- works with private sector to address challenges associated with the need to increase production and productivity; especially on the compliance of standards, and market based solutions (through innovation and open trade); supports collaboration on reducing food loss and waste, between scientists, other public agencies, and private sector to advance commodity based issues and improve competitiveness; facilitates communication with industry through Value-Chain Roundtables, which serves as a forum for identifying sectoral issues and encouraging industry led policy suggestions to achieve long-term global success for all partners;
- Chile – shared policies focusing on enhancing international trade and trade agreements such as harmonization of transparent and fair regulatory frameworks; promotion of competitiveness in agriculture; encouraged innovation and capacity building; adding value across the supply chain taking into account inclusive growth; Public and Private partnership to enhance food supply chains; reactivation and strengthen sub sectoral round tables at the different local and national levels;
- China – presented proposal for project on: Policy Research of Enhancing Food Security and Nutrition Sustainability of Low-Income and Lower-Middle Income groups, and Enhancing Connectivity of APEC Food Standards and Safety Assurance
- Hong Kong, China - presented the Global data standards as data sharing platform which is in the state of implementing pilot projects; Outcome of pilots and research to be reported to CTI at SOM1 to 3 in 2016; Final study will be available on AELM 2016

- Indonesia - informed of the Partnership for Indonesian Sustainable Agriculture which is participated by big food companies in the country ; establishment of 10 WG on priority commodities; looking into the value chains of each commodity;
- Japan – highlighted a policy of “AFFrinnovation”: namely, activity to promote primary industries, secondary industries and tertiary industries integrally and generate new added-value by combination, to increase the employment and income in rural areas, and stressed the importance of development of food value chains, referring to “APEC High Level Public-Private Forum on Cold Chains.”
- Korea – supports infrastructure development; provide investment in PPP projects like irrigation; sharing of agricultural technologies to partner countries; investment in food supply chain, climate-change resilient technologies; Sharing of agri production technology; promotion of PPP through the Korea Rural Development Corp; creation of policy environment to encourage PPP mechanisms;
- New Zealand - supports development through a number of co-funded programmes (government and private sector) namely: 1) Primary Growth Partnership Program (funded by the private sector to at least 50% of the total) – boasting productivity and profitability across primary industries for long-term economic growth; 2) Sustainable Farming Fund – focus on farming communities to do applied research and extension projects in order to generate environmental, economic and social benefits; and 3) Irrigation Acceleration Fund –supports the potential for irrigated agriculture to contribute to sustainable economic growth.
- Papua New Guinea - development agenda driven by vision 2020 (healthy, wealthy and wise society); Consideration of vulnerable groups; promotion of joint project (i.e. Capacity building for R&D, biodiversity and sharing of best practices; creating enabling environment for fishery infrastructure development, market facilities, cold storage, among others.
- Peru - improvements through installation of permanent crops, livestock capitalization with particular impact to forest. Promoting inclusive development with participation from women; Insurance mechanism in enabling small producers in times of risk

- Philippines - engagement of private sector in the food security policy formulation with focus on small scale farmers and fisherfolks; Co-sponsored with Chinese Taipei, the 3rd of series of seminars on strengthening public-private partnership to reduce food losses in the supply chain of fishery and livestock; development of project proposals that will strengthen adaptation/mitigation to climate change.
- Russia- collaboration on food security and even combating IUUF; supports the global data standards and labelling standard process
- Singapore – supports PPFS’ efforts, especially in reducing food losses and waste. Government efforts to support and collaborate with the industry include coordinating and facilitating trade to ensure food sources; training of workers and investment in technology to enhance production capabilities and raise productivity; adopting transformational farming systems; promoting technological innovations such as post-harvest processing to reduce food loss and test-bedding to reduce food waste.
- Chinese Taipei- Shared their initiatives and progress of work involving private sector participation pertaining to PPFS and food security with focus on the challenges and solutions for specific commodities like rice (training program and retail labeling requirement to improve rice quality), fishery (artificial propagation, multi-trophic approach in aquaculture).
- Thailand – Thailand presented Public-Private Partnership project initiative by Thai Feed Mill Association to set sustainability standard for maize plantation to enhance supply chain through sustainable feed mill production which will reduce impact on environment in general and food security in particular.
- The United States - Mentioned initiatives being undertaken in other working groups such as Food Safety Cooperation Forum’s PTIN project on aquaculture safety; combating wildlife trafficking (IUU fishing) in the anti-corruption working group; and an updated compendium of fisheries subsidies in the APEC region that was tabled in CTI at SOM 3. Looking at the broader question of the functioning and effectiveness of PPFS, the US said that the key question was how to enable the Partnership and economies to develop the capacity to deliver food security most effectively. One idea could be to develop ‘strategic themes’ to focus and direct PPFS efforts over multiple years. The US is also exploring the implications of urbanization for food security, reflecting the exponential growth of city-based populations; more work is needed in this area.

- Viet Nam - progress of 2 projects such as APEC Workshop on Develop Infra for Food Security and capability building Workshop on Coastal Community; climate smart agriculture proposal shall be enhanced for approval in the next round of call for proposal.

23. After presentations, Thailand clarified on what APEC Food standards is being referred to by China. The Vice-Chair from China suggest to find a way to encourage private sector participation. He added that instead of creating new standards, he suggest that different standards for different commodities from each economy be compiled and collate.

B. ABAC Insights

24. The ABAC Vice Chair expressed appreciation for the substantive inputs from member economies. He noted that for some economies, "food security" issues were localized; for others they were more international. Looking at the bigger picture, he commented that much of the Food Security Roadmap was focused on action points, but there were also considerable 'learnings' by individual economies that could be shared to help economies focus their efforts most effectively. (He suggested that APFIF could be tasked with producing a stocktake along those lines.) There was scope for greater levels of collaboration, both among economies and between the public and private sectors.

25. In that connection, although some of the biggest APEC economies had talked positively about the role of the private sector, it was unfortunate that there was not a greater private-sector presence at PPFS. Private-sector involvement needed to be enhanced. (He appreciated the participation in the meeting of small holder farmers and fisherfolks from the Philippines.) Indeed it would also be useful to get the consumer voice at the table too.

26. The Vice Chair thanked the US for its thoughtful comments, noting that food was the issue that touched on the greatest range of topics on the APEC agenda. While the US suggestions were constructive, we also needed to be careful not to duplicate work that was underway elsewhere in APEC; PPFS needed to serve the function of an overview and collaboration body.

27. The Chair requested the member economies to submit their written reports to the Secretariat so that a stock taking can be done.

SESSION IV – PPFS PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

A. Follow-up/updates/sharing of outputs on the PPFS Projects and Activities requiring Intervention/Cooperation on the following:

28. Member economies will participate and provide information to China as requested in the circulated questionnaires

- a. China thanked a number of member economies including the Philippines, Singapore, Chile, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Chinese Taipei, and Viet Nam for providing feedback. The rest of the economies are requested to fill up the questionnaire, provide electronic-copy of their respective grain quality standards, and nominate one or two representative/s who specialized in quality standards of wheat, rice, corn and soybean before end of October 2015. China further informed that the planned Workshop for Grain Quality Standards to be hosted by China will be conducted in 2016.
- b. Since the original proposal to hold the seminar on food loss reduction technology alongside with this PPFS meeting in Iloilo City did not push through and given the recent development of the ASEAN+3 Food Security Cooperation Meeting, the conduct of the former is now postponed to 2016.

29. Member economies and ABAC to cooperate with Chinese Taipei in the APEC Expert Consultation Workshop on “Food Loss Assessment Methodology in the Supply Chain of Fisheries & Livestock” (Multi-year ATCWG project), July 16-17, 2015

- a. In addition to the earlier sharing under agenda 3, Chinese Taipei further shared key results of two knowledge sharing activities conducted after the Boracay Meeting.
- b. The first activity was the APEC 2015 Expert Consultation on Assessment Methodology of Fishery and Livestock Losses held on 16-17 July 2015 in Taipei. It was attended by 14 member economies, seven experts and four APEC foras (ATCWG, PPFS, ABAC, and OFWG). Among the key findings on food security are: assessment surveys need to be shortened and better-targeted for best data; a consensus was reached on the such that legal definitions can be improved to reduce waste; and, government signaling to producers is an effective method to raise awareness of consumer needs and interests which reduce waste. Specific to private sector participation, it was noted the private

sector response is not sufficient yet and thus might require more time to be given to them.

- c. The second activity shared was the 3rd APEC Seminar on Strengthening Public-Private Partnership to Reduce Food Losses in Supply Chain of Fishery and Livestock Supply Chain conducted on 27 September 2015 in Iloilo City which focused on three main areas, namely: strengthening public-private partnership to reduce food losses in the supply chain of fishery and livestock; identifying practical solutions to enhance capacity building of reducing food losses in the supply chain of fishery and livestock; and, challenges and innovative technologies on reducing food losses in the supply chain of fishery and livestock. It was co-hosted with the Philippines and New Zealand and attended by 80 participants from 12 member economies with more than one-third from the private sectors. Among the next steps identified are data collection, analysis as well as knowledge and data sharing.

30. Member economies and ABAC will provide inputs to the Philippine Action Plan for the High Level Policy Dialogue on Food security and Blue Economy (HLPD FSBE), September 2015

- a. The Chair asked the Philippines if it received inputs from fellow member economies to which the later replied that more than 10 inputs were received. Further updates will be provided later by the Philippines in the later part of the meeting's agenda.

31. Member economies and ABAC to participate in the APEC seminar "Strengthening Public-Private Partnership to reduce Food Losses in the Supply Chain on Fisheries & Livestock" in Iloilo, September 27, 2015

- a. Chinese Taipei mentioned that in terms of policy recommendations, there are four recommendations which are hoped to be considered in the Ministers' statement:
 - i. Recognize and acknowledge the impact of food loss across the supply chain and the need for APEC economies to cooperate and address this as a critical challenge confronting the region;*
 - ii. Support investigation into the multi-dimensional aspects of food loss including: genetics, production, food safety, postharvest quality, logistic process, infrastructure improvement, consumer behaviours;*

- iii. Encourage capability development and the use of best practice business models, across all aspects of food loss in the supply chain;*
- iv. Foster communication and awareness among smallholders, business groups, researchers, decision makers, and the public for further collaborations in food loss assessment methodologies, toolkit development and for working in a wide variety of trade and sustainable development related policy issues.*

- b. All member economies were invited to participate in another seminar in Peru to solve problem of food waste by changing consumer behavior and response in retail sectors, an aspect which had not yet been focused on. Relevant information about the Peru seminar will be circulated through the APEC Secretariat.
- c. New Zealand, as co-host, thanked the Philippines and Chinese Taipei for organizing the seminar. It views that seminar was very successful with very good discussions and very engaged participants. It expressed its support in taking forward the output of the seminar to the higher APEC level.

31 The Philippines will share to other APEC member economies the former's process of involving small holders during an in-country consultation with the private sector

The Philippines shared its experience of doing an in-country consultation involving a strong private sector participation including that of small holders and how it intends to make such participation sustainable.

B. Reminders to PPFS Members

32. PPFS member economies and ABAC to cooperate in the implementation of the High Level Public-Private Forum on Cold Chain to Strengthen Agriculture and Food's Global Value Chain (Funded by APEC and Japan) (ATCWG Project) October 2015

- a. Japan shared that activity will take place on 28-30 October 2015 in Kagoshima, Japan. The activity will include lecture by experts, exhibition and on-site demonstration on cold chain technology. It is hoped that each economy's cold chain development will be promoted to increase income of small scale producers. This will be also a gathering of cold chain stakeholders where participants can network with partners. Results and documentation of the event will be shared in the APEC website.

- b. The Vice-Chair ABAC expressed interest on the feasibility of inviting food industry players from New Zealand and sought clarification as to what level of official will be invited. Japan responded that it will be at the Senior Official level and that the general information about the event had been circulated.

33 High level seminar on Small Farmer and SMEs Food (Rice, Wheat, Corn) Loss – Reduction technology and Experience (partly funded by China)

- a. China updated the meeting that the event will be hosted by China on July 2016. Furthermore, China will sponsor 1-2 delegates from each economy to attend. As to the level of participation, it will be made known later.

SESSION V – UPDATES ON THE COORDINATION WITH APEC-RELATED FORA AND MECHANISMS TO STRENGTHEN FOOD SECURITY

A. Agricultural Technical Cooperation Working Group (ATCWG) – (Undersecretary Segfredo Serrano, Department of Agriculture and Deputy Lead Shepherd of ATCWG)

- 34. The Philippines cited that the 19th Annual ATCWG meeting kicked off the Food Security Week activities. Presented were the meeting's objectives, outputs, and next steps in moving the strategic plan forward. Also shared were the ATCWG collaborative projects for 2014-2015 and its proposed collaborative projects. The ATCWG hoped to complete the necessary follow through activities in time for SOM1 in 2016.

B. High Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology (HLPDAB): Presentation by US on the results of the HLPDAB Workshop on Plant Breeding and Science Communication (held in June 2015)- (Mr. Ralph Bean, Agricultural Counselor, Foreign Agricultural Service, US Embassy, Manila)

- 35. The United States of America shared that the conduct of the subject HLPDAB is a collaborative effort with the Philippines and Mexico. The activity has two main components, namely: new innovations on plant breeding (day 1-3) and science communication (day 4-5). The first part provided a venue to discuss how current government policies and regulatory processes can support the development and generation of products from emerging innovations. The second part aims to help regulators communicate and engage the public. In doing so, there's a need to be transparent and the public has to be engaged in

the decision making process so they can understand the technology and how it can be managed.

36. Vice-Chair ABAC inquired as to whether there would be an opportunity to access the documents of the HLPDAB Seminar and shared to member economies to which the United States of America positively affirmed.

C. Ocean and Fisheries Working Group – (Allison Reed, NOAA Federal and OFWG Liaison to PPFS)

37. Ms. Allison Reed stated at the onset that the OFWG recognized the need to collaborate with other fora of APEC as early as 2013. The OFWG considered the Roadmap in developing the Food Security Action Plan. She also mentioned potential areas/topics that might be of interest to PPFS and other foras, the top two of which are joint effort to address nutrient input into water waste as well as impact of climate change to food security. The OFWG is currently working on its Strategic Plan for 2016-2018 which can be forwarded and shared to PPFS for information purposes once updated. She also reported that one OFWG proposed project got funding from APEC - Peru's Developing a Manual of Good Practices for Improving Value Chains for Marine Products.

38. During the open forum, Thailand pointed out that there are some points enumerated in the OFWG document which are redundant with the Committee on Trade. Thus, the OFWG may wish to focus on few priority points (two or three) for it to work on. In response, Ms. Reed expressed appreciation to Thailand's suggestion. She shared that the OFWG also struggled on which to prioritize. Nonetheless, the document is a living document and can be therefore continuously improved and enhanced. Specifically, she hoped that such effort of streamlining priorities can be given serious attention in the next OFWG Meeting. Specific to Thailand's comment on why should the OFWG be concerned on trade, Ms. Reed responded that it be focus on IUU and not the entire trade at large.

39. Russia also suggested to just prioritize and rank the points/topics rather than constantly changing/adding to the document.

D. Food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF) - (Ms. Karen Roscom, FSCF Philippine Representative)

40. The Philippines, in behalf of the FSCF, reported to the PPFS the background of the APEC FSCF and the FSCF Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN) as

well as the 5th APEC FSCF Meeting Progress Report. On the background of the APEC FSCS, salient points presented include its goals, four broad areas of capacity building priorities and composition and reporting. On the PTIN, reported were its five core areas of capacity building. As part of the Progress Report, mentioned were APEC FSCF Regulatory Cooperation Action Plan; APEC wine regulatory form; APEC FSCF PTIN; collaborations; and, assessment of PTIN capacity building initiatives.

E. Committee on Trade and Investment (CTI): Presentation on “Streamlining and Automating AgriFood Trade Procedures”- (Mr. Francis Lopez, President, InterCommerce, Philippines/ on behalf of UNESCAP)

41. The presentation was in two parts: Introduction to UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) as well as Streamlining and Automating AgriFood Trade Procedures.
42. Focus of the presentation includes: Trade facilitation framework to reduce trade transaction costs; the UNESCAP trade facilitation program with its three core areas which covers legislative that supports enabling paperless trade, capacity building and knowledge distribution; regional arrangement on the facilitation of cross-border paperless trade in Asia and the Pacific with its on-going negotiations and development; the UNNExt , which aims to use info tech to facilitate trade, along with its advisory group. Also given emphasis is agricultural trade facilitation; training activities and resources; Upcoming UNNExt Work Program on Agricultural Trade Facilitation; Asia-Pacific Trade Facilitation Forum; an illustration of a typical agrifood supply chain; case studies; focus areas in trade facilitation; SPS certification and the e-SPS; and the use of global standards.
43. In the ensuing open forum, several points were raised. The United States of America appreciated what the Philippines had done in its hosting where it declares a food security week such that related meetings are held within the same week. One area of improvement suggested though is to have back to back meetings/seminars with the ATCWG. The same holds true with OFWG too. Then a culminating meeting could be the PPFs meeting. This is because there is a need to have more communication and coordination of efforts between these groups. OFWG’s work in identifying areas for collaboration with PPFs was appreciated as well. On FSCF, the United States of America expressed appreciation for the work of FSCF and PTIN on food safety and expressed interest in learning more about FSCF and PTIN’s longer term plans on such issues as aquaculture safety.

44. Russia pointed out that the electronic certification (e-SPS) has become a key issue/concern as many member economies are interested on it as an instrument for seamless trading. Russia likewise supported the suggestion of USA regarding the hosting of back to back meetings between and among relevant APEC foras.
45. Vice-Chair ABAC welcomed the very informative updates, commenting that the topics got to the heart of member economies. The Vice Chair enquired as to how many of the APEC member economies were embracing or rapidly moving towards the trade facilitation framework presented. Australia, Korea, Canada and Chinese Taipei were among the economies mentioned. ASEAN member countries also trying to push this. As to the Vice Chair's query on to which sub-committee of CTI should take the lead on this activity, the answer was not yet clear.
46. The APEC Secretariat intervened that on USA's proposal on scheduling of PPFS next to ATCWG Meeting is a viable option due to strong linkages between two fora. It was also known that the ATCWG and HLPDAB scheduled to undergo independent assessment in 2016 and will have to be host next to one another.
47. The Chairperson mentioned that the suggested scheduling of meetings is also noted by Peru. Lastly, the United States expressed hope that it can be something institutionalized.
48. Australia pointed out that initiatives of this nature will help build the confidence of the private sector in terms of doing business in the Asia and Pacific regions.

SESSION VI – PPFS OPERATIONS AND WORKPLAN

49. The four working groups held their simultaneous discussions in four break out rooms to finalize their respective policy statements which will be endorsed and submitted by PPFS as inputs to the Leaders Meeting.

SESSION VII – PPFS OPERATIONS (CONTINUATION – PLENARY)

A. Reporting of Agreements per Working Group

50. The four working groups once again convened in plenary to report their respective outputs.

51. For WG1 on Stock-take and Food Security Road Map toward 2020, the Philippines reported on four major points to make the Road Map successful: need to monitor; need for a plan; private sector participation is key; and need for trainings for private sector so they can meaningfully participate. They also emphasized on the importance of fair trade practices and putting the people, including the vulnerable groups such as women and children, at the center so they will be protected from unfair trade practices. They stated that since climate change is the “new normal” and global events are fast changing, creative modifications to normal trade practices should be made to achieve both effective trade and sustainable development.
52. For WG2 on Sustainable Development of Agriculture and Fishery Sector, Singapore reported that given the several diverging views on the policy issues identified during the PPFS meeting in Boracay, the group agreed to enhance the identified statements inter-sessionally through emails for the next two weeks. Indonesia as Chair of the WG2 will facilitate the intercessional and finalize the statement.
53. For WG 3 on Facilitation of Investment and Infrastructure Development, China reported three policy statements which were agreed upon, to wit: The collection and sharing of information that matches production and markets; Making accessible and transparent regulations and requirements associated with making investments; and, Push risk reduction through Private Public Partnerships (PPP) that distribute the financial risks and benefits associated with investments in agriculture.
54. For WG4 on Enhancing Trade and Market, the ABAC Vice Chair reported several points. One, need for more specific information from industry and economies about non-tariff barriers which seriously deters trade. They intend to come up with a hit list (about 10) which the group would want to be acted upon by the Ministers. Two is the aim to reduce food loss, bringing it to 0-2%. The ABAC requested for more additional time on Day 2 (i.e., Agenda 11 on Other Matters maybe interchanged with Agenda 10 in the morning) so the Working Group/s can meet again to finalize the policy statements.

B. Intervention from Australia

55. During the Plenary discussion, Australia (supported by Canada) sought to take the policy statements back to capitals before final approval. The ABAC Vice Chair replied that this would not be appropriate. PPFS was a policy dialogue and not a trade negotiation. The policy statements reflected the actual

discussion that had taken place in the Working Groups (including with the involvement of the private sector): APEC Senior Officials could in due course choose to accept or reject the policy statements, but officials could not “filter” them first. Adopting the policy statements had to be done in Plenary and by consensus. Chairperson asked other economies’ views and clarified that any suggestion would have to be agreed in consensus.

56. The United States commented that one possible option could be to come up with a summary report of proceedings containing notations of key points, not necessarily to be called as policy statements, for Senior Officials’ consideration. The ABAC Vice Chair recalled that the previous year, the final output was called the Beijing Declaration in which the PPFS provided inputs especially on food security and food safety; there was a meshing in the process. The Chair recalled that it had been agreed in the Boracay Meeting that the PPFS would come up with policy statements as input to the Leaders. The Chair emphasised that his main concern was to ensure a fair process of coming up with the statements and not just the content of the statements.

57. After some further discussion, in which Canada emphasised that it was obliged to consult with capital, it was agreed that member economies could seek views on the policy statements from capitals, and revert by the deadline of 15 October 2015. The ABAC Vice Chair observed in closing that the private sector would not have a similar opportunity to feed in comments, even though the PPFS was meant to be a public-private partnership..

SESSION 8 – PPFS INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS AND ARRANGEMENTS

A. Review of PPFS and WG reporting formats- (PPFS Secretariat)

58. WG 1 requested for deferment since USec. Serrano is not yet around.

B. Presentation on ABAC considerations concerning the PPFS Terms of Reference (TOR) - (ABAC PPFS Co-Chair)

59. The ABAC Vice Chair briefly outlined the history of the development of the PPFS. He recalled the recommendations from the APEC Food System Meeting in September 2010 in Sendai, Japan, and talked also about the global food security landscape including related statistics and why the PPFS initiative was important to the private sector (and ABAC). He also recalled ABAC’s 10-year engagement duration in terms of APEC Food System and mentioned the four major recommendations made in 2009 which included the establishment of

high-level food dialogue, an end to export restrictions; and the use of APEC Food Cooperation to further the Doha Agenda.

60. The ABAC Vice Chair outlined the existing PPFS Terms of Reference (TOR), noting that they covered membership (government, private sector, APEC sub-fora and multilateral organizations, and research and academic institutions and NGOs); leadership; objectives; scope (including the need for PPFS to have a seat in various related fora such as ATCWG); and the modus operandi of the PPFS. He commented that the original Road Map Towards 2020 had stretched to 115 pages, but had now been whittled down.
61. Turning to the nub of his presentation, the ABAC Vice Chair observed that there was a need to review and improve many aspects of the TOR. PPFS participants needed to be more actively engaged, as did the private sector. PPFS could usefully have a seat at the table in other APEC fora, and vice versa. In short, the issues that needed to be considered and resolved included the following list – which had been endorsed by private sector representatives at the immediately preceding AP-FIF meeting: a single or multi-year leadership (Chair); continuity of membership; engagement with other APEC fora; engagement with private sector fora; working group structure; the continued validity of the objectives; the correctness of the scope in relation to other APEC fora; and whether changes were needed to the modus operandi.
62. The ABAC Vice Chair recalled that (albeit for valid reasons) Peru was only able to hold the first 2016 PPFS meeting in May next year. This would be too late in terms of progressing any reforms. Perhaps, he proposed, intersessional work could commence sooner (e.g. via email, webinars etc.) to move the review process ahead more quickly?
63. The Chair solicited views from the participating member economies. Australia reiterated the importance of engaging private sector participation and possibility of creating business incentives such as key topics of their interests to encourage their participation in international fora. Russia likewise emphasized that it should be a dialogue between the public and private sectors. He added that inter-sessional dialogues with the private sector could be maximized with modern technology.
64. The US appreciated the ABAC Vice Chair's presentation, commenting that these were critical questions for PPFS. On the question of continuity of membership, the US raised the need to ensure continuity of participation from the public sector as well as the private. Perhaps a focus on tightening the agenda (which at present was overwhelming and unwieldy) onto a set of

agreed priorities could assist in streamlining the discussions. As for the participation of the private sector, the Plenary discussions were useful, but a more open and frank format would allow a real dialogue to take place. WG4 (on trade and markets) seems to be working very well, but the other Working Groups should be reviewed. On the question of a revolving Chair, he endorses the ABAC Vice Chair's suggestion for a multi-year Chairmanship.

65. The ABAC Vice Chair replied that one challenge of APEC in terms of streamlining the agenda is that different member economies had different priorities and interests on food security. Likewise, he added that the WGs might usefully be aligned with the APEC themes.
66. The United States highlighted that there actually appears to be commonalities among the priorities of economies (i.e., climate smart agriculture, trade, food waste and loss) and suggested developing a more robust, strategic-focused agenda and multi-year approach to activities.
67. Indonesia cited new emerging developments in the recent decade which include the increasing role of the small holders, and the role of fisheries in Food Security. He suggested that TOR could be reviewed to reflect these new developments.
68. OFWG thanked the Vice Chair for the excellent presentation. She agreed that PPFS needed to take the 'thought leadership' on broader issues than simply the topics covered in each Working Group. OFWG recalled the previous coordination mechanisms between PPFS and OFWG which paved the way for appointing an OFWG Liaison to the PPFS. She suggested the need to institutionalize these coordination mechanisms by way of having a PPFS liaison to the OFWG, who should preferably be from private sector.
69. Vice-Chair from Peru expressed that they would also want strong participation from both government and private sector as it headed towards the next Ministers' Meeting, but observed that continuity of participation could be a real challenge for governments. She emphasized the need to work very closely with ABAC and requested ABAC to keep the food issues alive in their dialogue with the Leaders. She commented that it was PPFS *itself* that should be giving policy guidance to other APEC fora on food (either through SOM or working towards having a mandate in the Leaders or Ministers) is sought for and further solicited proposals and ideas as early as possible inter-sessionally. She likewise shared that Peru is contemplating scheduling back to back OFWG and PPFS meetings during the Food Security Week and a possibility of High Level Policy Dialogue with Ministers and private sector leaders, guided by ABAC, in 2016.

70. Chile agreed to looking at PPFs in relation to the other Working Groups. She agreed on the multi-year Chairing proposal and hoped that it would be for more than two years. She also suggested that each member economy could designate two or three representatives (public and private sector representatives). She emphasized the need for follow-ups within and among Fora and Working Groups for concrete actions on issues at hand.
71. Vice-Chair from ABAC recalled that about 5 years ago there was almost no dialogue between ABAC and the APEC foras and sub-foras. He shared that a dialogue first began with ABAC and the Senior Officials which was quite a challenge and recognized that as of date, ABAC has been receiving numerous invitations to related meetings.
72. The Chairperson pointed out that the discussion points put forward by the ABAC Vice Chair were more of a structural concern covering leadership and membership in the PPFs. He encouraged member economies to think of proper structures to address the issues on continuity and making the meeting agenda more interesting to engage participation especially from the Private Sector.
73. Thailand stated the observation that there might still be continuity even in the current structure, and asked how long a multi-year leadership would be. The ABAC Vice Chair cited structural set-ups from other APEC fora like the CTI which had a multi-year term of three years given its very complex agenda and long-term projects. However, he said that the bigger challenge on continuity of membership lay in the participation of the Private Sector.
74. China observed that for some economies continuity is easy while others find it more difficult. Pre-meetings between the incoming and out-going representatives within economies maybe of help.
75. Russia stressed that continuity of participation is the key word. On the agenda, he highlighted the difference between a negotiation and a dialogue, both need to be focused. The Chair shared that the primary objective will be a dialogue.
76. The ABAC Vice Chair replied to Chile's point stating that the critical point would be the continuity of private-sector participation. On the United States's comments, the Vice Chair observed that the PPFs agenda already covered a wide range of critical and new issues, which had positives and negatives, but we should not seek to reinvent the wheel.

77. The ABAC Vice Chair noted that it had been a very interesting discussion. He suggested that member economies provide considered comments by 15 October 2015. (OFWG sought clarification that this applied also to OFWG – the ABAC Vice Chair said any such inputs would be welcome, although the main focus was for PPFS participants to feed in their ideas.)
78. The representative from Cargill noted that this had been a very valuable discussion, and that every effort should be made to find common ground and provide an ongoing forum for dialogue with the private sector.
79. Chinese Taipei agreed to ABAC's point of not re-inventing the wheel and maximize the existing mechanisms and formats to include interesting topics to generate private sector participation and create policy recommendations and concrete outputs.
80. The United States' private sector representative shared his thoughts on having a continuous agenda. He suggested to focus on few key critical areas which can serve as the common ground for both government and private sector.
81. The Chairperson revealed that in the Boracay Meeting, there was intent to really prioritize the list of agenda items. The Chair was glad to note that this had surfaced from the member economies themselves. He then suggested that a prioritization exercise be considered in the 2016 meeting. He reiterated that PPFS participants should submit comments by 15 October 2015.

C. Discussion on the inclusion of smallholders and SMEs in APEC-related meetings, projects and activities

82. China opened the invitation for its hosting of APEC-related activities in 2016 emphasizing that the participation of SMEs and smallholders is very much welcomed.
83. ABAC clarified on what level are welcomed. China answered that micro to large enterprises are welcome. ABAC suggested that micro and small enterprises maybe be better represented by associations who can serve as their voice during meetings/seminars/fora.
84. Canada appreciates the suggestion of including other parties in the WG and requested a clear understanding of the benefits of including smallholders and SMEs in PPFS.

D. Presentation on the outcomes and recommendations from the 2nd Asia Pacific Food Industry Forum (AP-FIF) meeting in Singapore, 30 September 2015 - (ABAC PPFS Co-Chair)

85. ABAC shared the highlights of the 2nd Asia Pacific Food Industry Forum (AP-FIF) Meeting which was attended by 18 participants from industry, research and private sector trade organizations. The AP-FIF group had discussed the food security related text in the ABAC Letter and Report to APEC Economic Leaders, current issues in food trade.

86. The key messages that AP-FIF wanted to convey to PPFS included the following: that food trade is vital for food security; that governments should let markets work (and that food self-sufficiency policies could have negative unintended consequences); that ambition on market access for food should remain high in trade negotiations; that the private sector had a key role to play in partnership with governments in finding market-based solutions to food security challenges; that chokepoints and challenges in supply chains and global value chains needed to be addressed, including in relation to NTBs, low levels of SME participation, the need for science-based food safety measures and robust food standards based on international standards such as Codex, and the need to recognise the potential of new and innovative technologies including genetic modification. Finally, AP-FIF considered that there should be a review of the Food Security Roadmap with a view to refining priorities and responsibilities, potentially alongside future AP-FIF work on NTBs and engagement with other private sector food bodies and fora.

SESSION IX. PREPARATIONS FOR THE HIGH LEVEL POLICY DIALOGUE ON FOOD SECURITY AND BLUE ECONOMY (HLPD-FSBE)

A. Discussion on the preparation for the High Level Policy Dialogue on Food Security and Blue Economy

87. The Philippines stated that the activity, which builds on previous APEC commitments, is an initiative of the host economy to advance priorities considered of importance that need enhanced actions with support of member economies for endorsement to the Leaders. Three priority areas are: Resilient Oceans, Coastal Resources and Ecosystems and Sustainable Aquaculture; Fish Loss Reduction; and, Agribusiness for Inclusive Growth. The Philippines likewise shared updates on on-going the preparations for the subject event.

B. Discussion on the possible areas of cooperation and collaboration between PPFS and OFWG relative to the HLPD-FSBE

88. Vice Chair from China suggested to use the APEC Food Security Roadmap Towards 2020, and not just the PPFS Roadmap, as the main reference for the HLPD. This was noted by the Philippines.

(Note: the Roadmap Towards 2020 and the PPFS Roadmap are one and the same. Complete title is "APEC Food Security Roadmap Towards 2020")

89. The Chair stated that there is a good collaboration between PPFS and OFWG in terms of developing the agenda for the upcoming HLPD.

C. Overview of the presentations on the development of Precision Seafood Harvesting Technology, the New Zealand Fisheries Quota Management System, Australia's use of the 'internet of things' for remote sensing in aquaculture, and the New Zealand kiwifruit industry as a global best practice example for sustainable food production and value creation for small holders - (ABAC New Zealand)

90. ABAC clarified that its contribution to the HLPD-FSBE will be a presentation of this topic. However, he added that interested economies and fora may approach him for possible discussion.

SESSION 10. RECONVENING OF THE WG TO FINALIZE THEIR POLICY STATEMENTS

91. As requested and agreed in Day 1, WGs were given time to continue their work in developing their respective policy statements for inputs to the Minister's statement and hopefully toward the Leaders Declaration.

SESSION 11: LOOKING AHEAD

A. Discussion on PPFS inputs to the Ministerial Statement and Leaders' Declaration

Reporting/Presentation of the WGs

92. The Chairperson clarified that what each WG will present are the suggestions of each WG. It will be then subjected to comments/inputs in plenary.

93. For WG 1 on Stock-Take and Food Security Roadmap Towards 2020, the suggested policy statements read as:

- a. We urge PPFS and relevant APEC fora to continue to implement and monitor progress on the APEC Food Security Roadmap Towards 2020, and to focus on priority themes so that APEC can more effectively achieve progress in addressing food security issues in the Asia-Pacific region;
- b. We re-emphasize the vital role of the private sector, and encourage active, meaningful participation of the private sector (which include small farmers and fishers; micro, small and medium-sized enterprises; and women) and other relevant stakeholders in APEC food security activities; and,
- c. We further ask the PPFS to enhance communication and collaboration among relevant APEC sub-fora on food security.

94. For WG 2 on Sustainable Development of Agriculture and Fishery Sector, the proposed policy statements are:

- a. Promoting research, development and technology dissemination;
- b. Strengthening small holders and women organization, cooperation and resilience, protecting small holders and women from negative impacts (e.g. climate change), empowering them into the food supply and value chain, and enhancing services and training for them;
- c. Promoting sustainable management and use of natural resources; and,
- d. Promoting consumption of sustainably produced food.

95. For WG3 on Facilitation of Investment and Infrastructure Development, the following policy statements are proposed:

- a. The need is pressing for improving the food security and nutrition sustainability among low-income and lower-middle-income groups in the Asia-Pacific region;
- b. Improving Food Security and Nutrition Sustainability of Low-Income and Lower-Middle-Income Groups in the Asia-Pacific Region; and,
- c. Highlight the critical roles and important contribution of investment and infrastructure development for sustainable food security and nutrition.

96. For WG4 on Enhancing Trade and Markets, below are the proposed policy statements:

- a. The Working Group on Enhancing Trade and Markets had detailed discussions on promoting open and transparent markets for fair

trade in fisheries and agriculture products and reducing food waste and food loss.

- b. On non-tariff barriers, the Working Group agreed that a greater focus on identifying a limited list of the most onerous NTBs, seeking to establish a useful taxonomy to categorize them, analysing their economic importance, and finding practical collaborative solutions to address them would be essential, both to address current impediments to trade and to allow APEC members to establish robust frameworks for future trade agreements. The group agreed that regulatory coherence and alignment with international and science-based measures would be important in those processes.
- c. On global data standards, the Working Group agreed that the broader use of such approaches, building on the results of the pilot projects already underway, would enhance food security in the region including by potentially addressing non-tariff barriers to the smooth flow of trade in food products.
- d. On transparency and traceability, the Working Group agreed on the need for increasing awareness about the challenges of food fraud and food defence.
- e. The Working Group acknowledged the importance of developing standards and testing for product and nutritional quality to enhance food security and reduce friction in international trade.
- f. The Working Group agreed to strengthen capacity-building efforts to promote greater trade flows of food in the Asia-Pacific region.
- g. On trade agreements, the Working Group urged APEC Members to ratify the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement, noting that this would make an important contribution to economic growth, which enhances food security.
- h. On food loss and waste, the Working Group agreed that application of sustainable business practices, with particular emphasis on cold chain and efficient border practices, could generate win-win outcomes in respect of reducing food loss. The Working Group further agreed that APEC members should continue efforts to understand the consumer drivers and opportunities to reduce food waste.

B. Plenary Discussion on the Proposed Policy Statements

97. The Chair clarified on how the session shall proceed. The meeting agreed that comments will be made after all the four presentations.

98. For WG1 on Stock-take and Food Security Road Map toward 2020, Australia proposed to add statement on ensuring a coordinated and comprehensive

approach. Philippines suggested to add statement "So that a coordinated and comprehensive approach can be achieved." As had been agreed by Australia, the statement accepted paragraph is as follows:

"We urge PPFS and relevant APEC fora to continue to implement and monitor progress on the APEC Food Security Roadmap, and to focus on priority themes so that APEC can more effectively achieve progress in addressing food security issues in the Asia-Pacific region. We re-emphasize the vital role of the private sector, and encourage active, meaningful participation of the private sector (which include small farmers and fishers; micro, small and medium-sized enterprises; and women) and other relevant stakeholders in APEC food security activities. We further ask the PPFS to enhance communication and collaboration among relevant APEC sub-fora on food security so that a coordinated and comprehensive approach can be achieved."

99. For WG2 on Sustainable Development of Agriculture and Fishery Sector, Russia's proposed to add "feasibility traceability system" in sentence 3. ABAC and Thailand raised apprehension that said matter does not fit in WG 2. The Chair suggested that the statement will be noted and be placed in it in an appropriate paragraph. He also encouraged Russia to look into statement of WG 4.

100. With suggestions/inputs from Vice Chairs of ABAC and Peru, Australia, Chile, US, Singapore and UNESCAP, the group adopted the statement, subject to style:

"In order to achieve sustainable development, we encourage PPFS to focus on promoting research, development and technology dissemination, strengthening small holders and women organization, cooperation and resilience, protecting small holders and women from current and future negative impacts (e.g. climate change), empowering them into the food supply and value chain, and enhancing services and training for them, promoting sustainable management and use of natural resources; and promoting the consumption of sustainably produced food."

101. For WG 3 on Facilitation of Investment and Infrastructure Development, PPFS Vice Chair from China, Vice Chair from Peru and Canada proposed improvements on the statement, as follows:

" We recognize the critical need of food security and nutrition sustainability among low-income and lower-middle-income groups in the Asia-Pacific region, and call on APEC economies to promote related projects while highlighting also

the critical roles and important contribution of investment and infrastructure development for sustainable food security and nutrition.”

102. For WG4 on Enhancing Trade and Market, the first and third paragraph was accepted in plenary with inputs from Vice Chair of Peru and China.
103. On the paragraph on Global Data Standards, Indonesia raised that trade agreement matters were discussed extensively in CTI and should be endorsed there, rather than in PPFS. Approval was held pending, to allow Indonesia to consult their capital on the matter.
104. On the fourth paragraph, Philippines (supported by Russia) proposed to add sentence that “PPFS shall push for early resolution for early resolution of the public stockholding issue in the WTO” at the end of the paragraph. ABAC New Zealand noted that the public stockholding topic had not even been raised in the Working Group discussion (which the policy statement was meant to reflect). Further, unlike the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement which was the subject of the remainder of that paragraph, the public stockholding issue was controversial and had not been agreed by WTO Members. The US added that it could not agree to any reference to public stockholding. After some further discussion the meeting then agreed to conduct further consultation from their capital on the entire paragraph.

The working document appears as follows:

- a. *“On non-tariff barriers, we advise PPFS to focus on identifying a limited list of the most onerous NTBs, seeking to establish a useful taxonomy to categorize them, analyzing their economic importance, and finding practical collaborative solutions to address them, both to address current impediments to trade and to allow APEC members to establish robust frameworks for future trade agreements. Regulatory coherence and alignment with international and science-based measures would be important in those processes.*
- b. *On global data standards, we follow with interest the possibility of a broader use of such approaches, building on the results of the pilot projects already underway, would enhance food security in the region including by potentially addressing non-tariff barriers to the smooth flow of trade in food products, transparency and traceability, including the need for increasing awareness about the challenges of food fraud and food defense.*

- c. *We acknowledge the importance of developing standards and testing for product and nutritional quality to enhance food security and reduce friction in international trade, and the need to strengthen capacity-building efforts to promote greater trade flows of food in the Asia-Pacific region.*
- d. *[We call on APEC economies to take necessary steps to ratify the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement in due time, noting that this would make an important contribution to economic growth, which enhances food security. [In addition, we shall push for early resolution of the public stockholding issue in the WTO.]]*
- e. *On food loss and waste, we urge the application of sustainable business practices, with particular emphasis on cold chain and efficient border practices, to generate win-win outcomes in respect of reducing food loss. APEC economies should also continue efforts to understand the consumer drivers and opportunities to reduce food waste.”*

105. The Chair congratulated the economies for the hard work and providing useful comments and request the same to respond within 10 days and that failure to do so will be considered as an acquiescence/acceptance from their end.

C. Discussion on the preparation/inputs for PPFS 2016

106. Peru presented their on-ongoing preparations for their hosting of APEC 2016. She highlighted the priorities to include REI, fostering the Regional Food market, modernization of MSMEs, and human capital development. She added that Peru intends to follow the set-up of the Philippines’ hosting where there will be back to back meetings of HLPDAB, ATCWG, OFWG, PPFS, and MFS in May and September 2016. Further, she added that there will be four priority areas – sustainability, market access, investment and infrastructure, and related services. She also mentioned that Peru is open to receive inputs and suggestions from member economies thru email address: apec2016@rree.gob.pe.

107. US expressed appreciation and commitment to continuously and actively support Peru in its hosting of APEC 2016. He put forward the idea of moving toward re-evaluation of the entire process of PPFS, including its TOR. He sought clarification on whether PPFS will be subjected to an independent review. APEC Secretariat replied that PPFS is not scheduled to undergo such independent review since review is undertaken by SCE while PPFS reports

directly to the SOM. ABAC support such suggestion of reviewing the PPFS processes.

108. Chinese Taipei suggested for PPFS to work closely with ATCWG and OFWG, thus the schedules of meeting should be a parallel meeting of ATCWG and OFWG. The PPFS meeting she suggested can then follow to be able to generate inputs from the two other Working Groups. Moreover, she suggested co-hosting of a back-to-back event (Seminar 4 on Strengthening Public-Private Partnership on Reducing Food Loss & Waste in Retail and Consumption) during the Food Security Week. Vice-Chair Peru affirmed to the suggestion of Chinese Taipei on the schedule. Further, she suggested that the review of the TOR be done inter-sessionally as it needs approval by last week of February up to 1st week of March 2016, and look into the timing of the Ministerial Meetings for PPFS to synchronize the Meeting agenda.

109. For information of the Meeting, Thailand informed that Thailand use to proposed activities which can fall under 2 Work Streams of WG2; (1) Promoting research and development and technology dissemination and (2) Ensuring sustainable management of natural resources. In this regard, Thailand would like to integrate these 2 activities to be the self-funded project called "International Soil Conference on the topic of Sustainable Uses of Soil in Harmony with Food Security" by including some issues from previous proposed activities in PPFS. The "International Soil Conference on Sustainable Uses of Soil in Harmony with Food Security" was held on 18-21 August 2015, Phetchaburi Province, Thailand. This international conference was aimed to exchange views and experiences in relation to sustainable uses of soils to secure food production of our societies. Government officials, soil experts from ASEAN and APEC was invited to this conference.

D. Presentation on "Regional Food Market" - (Peru)

110. Vice Chair from Peru shared a video presentation on the 2016 APEC hosting.

SESSION 12: REVIEW AND ADOPTION OF THE SUMMARY REPORT

111. A copy of the draft summary report will be furnished to the members of the Drafting Committee within the day for comments and inputs. Member economies are then given 15 days after the end of the HLPD-FSBE Meeting on October 7, 2015 for additional inputs and comments, otherwise the Summary Report would be deemed approved.

112. Philippines informed the Meeting that all policy statements should be submitted to the DA-NOC who is in-charge in finalizing the document by

October 15, 2015. The Chair then advised that economies that need consultation with capital on the policy statements to submit feedback within seven days from today.

SESSION 13: WRAP UP AND CLOSING REMARKS

113. The Vice Chair from China expressed that this year's hosting of the Philippines of related meetings have fruitful meeting towards achieving 'free from hunger and malnutrition in 2020.
114. The Vice Chair from Peru thanked the member economies for the contribution to the Meeting and look forward to welcoming everyone to the APEC 2016 in Peru.
115. The Vice Chair from ABAC expressed appreciation to the Meeting delegates for their active participation and substantial inputs and feedback on the TOR. He cited that the TOR should be further improved in the future, especially changing the modus operandi and finding reasons for new engagements. He then thanked the Chair for the arrangements and look forward to the upcoming Leader's Meeting in November 2015.
116. The APEC Secretariat expressed appreciation on the hard work of the economies in the Meeting. He looked forward to the intersessional work between now and the next meeting, and thanked everybody for their participation.
117. The Chair closed the meeting by encouraging member economies to continue bringing life to PPFS and hoped to see everyone again in Peru.
