



**Asia-Pacific
Economic Cooperation**

**Independent Assessment Report of the
Agricultural Technical Cooperation Working
Group (ATCWG)
and the
High Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural
Biotechnology (HLPDAB)**

**SOM Steering Committee on Economic and Technical
Cooperation (SCE)**

November 2016

APEC Project: SCE/IA/2016

Produced by

Dr Lyndal Thorburn
Sustineo Pty Ltd
27 Torrens St Braddon ACT 2601
Tel: (61) 2 6140 4278
www.sustineo.com.au

For

Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Secretariat
35 Heng Mui Keng Terrace
Singapore 119616
Tel: (65) 68919 600
Fax: (65) 68919 690
Email: info@apec.org
Website: www.apec.org

© 2016 APEC Secretariat

APEC#216-ES-01.5

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
INTRODUCTION	9
Structure of this Assessment.....	10
BACKGROUND	10
Method.....	10
ATCWG	10
HLPDAB.....	12
ALIGNMENT WITH APEC PRIORITIES	15
Bogor Goals 1994	15
APEC Leaders’ Growth Strategy 2010	15
ECOTECH Priorities	17
APEC Tasking Statement for 2015.....	21
Other APEC Food and Agricultural Priorities.....	22
APEC Gender Agenda	23
Conclusions.....	23
FORUM OPERATIONS	25
Pre-meeting management and documentation.....	25
Meetings.....	25
Project initiation, funding and management	28
Communication	28
Structure and Operations.....	29
Conclusions.....	31
COOPERATION.....	32
Relationship between HLPDAB, ATCWG and PPFS.....	32
Cooperation with other APEC Fora	33
Cooperation with other Stakeholders.....	33
Conclusions.....	34
RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE	34
Terms of Reference	35
Strategic and Work Plans	35
Project initiation and management.....	36
Structure and Operations.....	36
Cooperation.....	36
Appendix A – APEC Working Groups.....	38

Appendix B – Method.....	40
Appendix C – Results of Written Survey.....	41
HLPDAB Survey.....	41
ATCWG Survey.....	50
Appendix D – Interviews.....	60
Appendix E – Source Documents	61
Appendix F – ATCWG Publications	62

TABLES

Table 1: ATCWG Projects 2013-2016.....	12
Table 2: Mapping of Recent ATCWG projects against Leaders’ Growth Strategy.....	16
Table 3: Mapping of ATCWG 2015-2025 Strategic Plan against ECOTECH Goals	19
Table 4: Mapping of ATCWG Projects against APEC ECOTECH Priorities.....	19
Table 5: Mapping of 2013-2015 Work Plan against ECOTECH Goals	20
Table 6: ATCWG Initiatives Mapped Against the APEC 2015 Tasking Statement	21
Table 7: Attendance at 2015 meetings	26
Table 8: ATCWG Meeting History	29
Table 9: HLPDAB Meeting History	30
Table 10: Potential Overlaps between PPFS, ATCWG and HLPDAB	32

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report contains an independent assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of APEC's Agricultural Technical Cooperation Working Group (ATCWG) and the High Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology (HLPDAB).

APEC sought an independent review of the operations and structure of the APEC Agricultural Technical Cooperation Working Group (ATCWG) and High Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology (HLPDAB) in order to ensure that their economic and technical cooperation (ECOTECH) activities are targeted, effective, efficient, and make the best use of scarce resources. This report recommends actions to ensure that the ATCWG and HLPDAB respond to APEC's current priorities and contribute to the achievement of APEC's overall vision and objectives.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the assessment were:

- to evaluate whether ATCWG and HLPDAB are operating effectively and efficiently;
- to assess whether their Terms of Reference, strategic plan or operations could be modified to better respond to APEC ECOTECH priorities and contribute to the achievement of APEC goals;
- to identify ways to strengthen their strategic priorities and direction for future work;
- to recommend on how they can better focus and more efficiently and effectively manage their tasks and assure that capacity building activities are providing benefits according to Leaders' and Ministers' priorities;
- to identify synergies among their work and that of other relevant APEC groups;
- to identify opportunities and provide recommendations for greater collaboration with non-APEC parties, including the private sector, civil society and other international organizations; and ways for the fora to tap resources for programs; and
- to explore how they can better take into account the APEC commitment to give gender greater consideration in accordance with directions outlined by the Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy (PPWE).

The ATCWG was formed in 2000 and HLPDAB in 2001. HLPDAB is the only High Level Policy Dialogue in APEC with an ongoing mandate, established due to APEC's recognition of the potential for biotechnology in agriculture and its complex regulatory issues. Both were last evaluated in 2012, hence, the term of the evaluation spans 2013-2015.

Key findings - effectiveness

The **ATCWG** is an active working group whose members demonstrate a commitment to working group activities. Its Terms of Reference have largely been translated into a Strategic Plan and Work Program that align with Leaders' Growth strategy and the ECOTECH priorities, but align less so with the Bogor Goals – the latter because ATCWG is more focussed on technical issues rather than tariffs and non-tariff barriers.

The group has benefited from the long term chairmanship of China, which is now stepping down from the role after 6 years. There is a risk that the new regime proposed, with the Chair to come from the host economy, will result in the group losing momentum. Little

overt attention is paid to APEC's gender agenda, either through actions from the Tasking Statement for 2015 or specifically in projects.

Issues of concern for ATCWG

1. The strategic plan, while effective, would benefit from a tighter connection to the overall Terms of Reference and needs a mechanism to track performance from meeting to meeting.
2. Concept Notes need to be framed to more closely align with APEC's goals and hence attract more support from SCE. There is also a need to take a broader view of what constitutes "agricultural technical" issues (e.g. food insecurity, animal as well as plant agriculture, innovation and structural economic issues which involve micro and small to medium enterprises) so that the working group can realise opportunities for cooperation with other APEC fora, and non-APEC organisations. A broader approach would also enable them to tap into a greater range of APEC sub-funds.
3. There is no recognition of APEC's gender agenda and hence no discussion of this in meetings.
4. There is a risk that the proposed changes to the selection of the Chair and supporting team (troika system) will result in the working group losing momentum in a working group which has only one meeting per year. The success of the troika system for ATCWG will need to be monitored by ATCWG and APEC.

HLPDAB is a long running policy dialogue that is addressing complex regulatory issues. Its 2016 workshop was a success and drove the main agenda items discussed in 2016. The topics considered are of major importance in APEC's trade agenda. HLPDAB has had limited access to central APEC funding and is still learning how to develop Concept Notes that attract central funding support.

Issues of concern for HLPDAB

1. There are signs that economies are failing to engage with the forum: attendance is falling, some economies appear not to be sending delegates skilled in the topics to be considered, and many economies are sending the same delegates to both HLPDAB (which is meant to be a high level meeting) and ATCWG (which is a technical meeting).
2. HLPDAB has not had a multi-year strategic plan during the period 2012-2015, but it is noted that in 2015 it approved a Strategic Plan for 2016-2018. This needs to be reviewed to ensure that it aligns more closely with terms of reference and has measurable goals that are then tracked over time.

Key findings – efficiency

Both fora have a common secretariat and are being run efficiently. Papers are generally available on time and numbers are manageable.

Issues of concern

1. There are major concerns with timetabling. In 2016, the HLPDAB meeting was still running when ATCWG commenced. As a result, ATCWG's planning meeting (held the day before the formal meeting) was unsuccessful and many economies missed its main morning session (that is, half of the formal meeting) because the same delegates were still attending HLPDAB.
2. Reporting to PPFS is essential because of common interests, but is not being well-structured, with ATCWG unrepresented at the PPFS meeting.

3. In 2016, the concurrence of HLPDAB, ATCWG and PPFS in Food Security Week caused some delays with finalisation of papers, but these did not hamper the committee's operations.

Key findings – Cooperation

For ATCWG there are opportunities for engagement with PPWE as well as SMEWG, PPSTI and PPFS (within APEC).

For HLPDAB there are opportunities for engagement with HRWG and PPFS (within APEC) and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the Organization for Economic and Cooperation and Development (OECD) (external to APEC).

Issues of concern

1. Members of both fora have a narrow view of their scope of application (limiting discussions to plant genetic engineering) and hence are less aware of opportunities for collaboration than they might be. This negatively affects the strategy employed for development of Concept Notes and project proposals.

Recommendations

ATCWG

ATCWG Recommendation 1: ATCWG should continue and its Terms of Reference amended to include specific reference to consideration of women in the agricultural economy.

ATCWG Recommendation 2: ATCWG's Strategic Plan needs to be re-cast so that its individual goals are more clearly aligned with its Terms of Reference. Further, at each meeting a paper summarising measurable, objective progress towards its strategic goals should be included as a standing Agenda Item, with this paper being prepared by the ATCWG Secretariat.

ATCWG Recommendation 3: Concept Notes need to focus on APEC priorities in order to increase their likelihood of success, expand their sources of funding to a larger number of APEC sub-funds, and seek co-sponsorship, where appropriate, with other fora including PPFS, PPSTI, SMWEG and PPWE.

ATCWG Recommendation 4: There should be no overlap between the scheduled meeting times of ATCWG and HLPDAB

ATCWG Recommendation 5: ATCWG Recommendation 1: ATCWG should continue and its Terms of Reference amended to include specific reference to consideration of women in the agricultural economy.

ATCWG Recommendation 6: ATCWG's agenda should allow for a joint session between HLPDAB and ATCWG to discuss any issues that are common to both groups. This session should go beyond a simple presentation by HLPDAB to ATCWG.

ATCWG Recommendation 7: ATCWG should attend and present to plenary sessions of PPFS

ATCWG Recommendation 8: ATCWG and PPFS should be reviewed at the same time in the next Working Group review cycle

ATCWG Recommendation 9: ATCWG should continue its engagement with the private sector, and expand its consideration of technologies relevant to agriculture so it can address its broad objectives more effectively.

HLPDAB

HLPDAB Recommendation 1: HLPDAB should continue its work until the current topics of low level presence and data transfer are resolved. However, if attendance in 2017 is below that required for a quorum it should be closed immediately and its work program transferred to PPFS.

HLPDAB Recommendation 2: HLPDAB should review its Strategic Plan to ensure alignment with its Terms of Reference. The Strategic Plan needs to contain objective, measurable goals, progress toward which is reported at each meeting.

HLPDAB Recommendation 3: The secretariat should work with Chair of HLPDAB to identify gaps in activities compared to APEC priorities and seek Concept Notes that will fill these gaps.

HLPDAB Recommendation 4: HLPDAB should continue to hold its workshops prior to the main annual meeting.

HLPDAB Recommendation 5: HLPDAB should attend and present to to plenary sessions of PPFS

HLPDAB Recommendation 6: HLPDAB should invite speakers from the FAO and/or OECD to its next meeting or workshop in order to learn from their current considerations of mutually relevant topics

INTRODUCTION

The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) was established in 1989 to leverage the growing interdependence of economies around the Pacific Rim. APEC has 21 member economies which together aim to create greater regional prosperity and enhance regional economic integration. Within APEC, decisions are reached by consensus and capacity building projects funded by APEC economies play an important role.

Four core committees and their respective working groups provide strategic policy recommendations to APEC Leaders and Ministers, set the vision for overarching goals and initiatives each year. The working groups implement these initiatives by funding a variety of projects either individually or through central APEC funds.¹

Working groups, such as the Agricultural Technical Cooperation Working Group (ATCWG) have been established under the auspices of the Senior Officials Meeting (SOM) Steering Committee (SCE) on Economic and Technical Cooperation (ECOTECH) to further specific APEC goals. Working groups in APEC provide strategic policy recommendations to APEC Leaders and Ministers and implement annual goals and initiatives set by Ministers. The main way that working groups implement these goals is through projects, which may be funded through a number of central APEC funds or by one or more economies directly (“self-funded”)

In addition, policy dialogues, such as the High Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology (HLPDAB) have been established and may report directly to the SOM. Policy dialogues are intended to deal with more intractable policy issues, and as such need to have skilled delegates who are in a position to influence the outcomes of multilateral discussions within their own economies.

In 2016, APEC’s regular evaluation program included an independent assessment of the operations and structure of the ATCWG and the HLPDAB in order to ensure that their activities are targeted, effective, efficient, and make the best use of scarce resources. Sustineo was commissioned to work cooperatively with the ATCWG Lead Shepherd and the HLPDAB Chair, delegates to both groups, the SCE, and the APEC Secretariat to provide a robust analysis of the work and operations of the group and recommendations for ways to ensure the overall goals and objectives of APEC are met. The terms of reference for the independent assessment were:

- to evaluate whether ATCWG and HLPDAB are operating effectively and efficiently;
- to assess whether the group’s Terms of Reference, strategic plan or operations could be modified to better respond to APEC ECOTECH priorities and contribute to the achievement of APEC goals;
- to identify ways to strengthen ATCWG’s and HLPDAB’s strategic priorities and direction for future work;
- to provide recommendations on how the forum can better focus and more efficiently and effectively manage its tasks and assure that its capacity building activities are providing benefits according to Leaders’ and Ministers’ priorities;
- to identify ways to develop synergies among the work of the forum and other relevant APEC groups;
- to identify opportunities and provide recommendations for greater collaboration with non-APEC parties, including the private sector, civil society and other

¹ www.apec.org/about-us/about-apec.aspx

- international organizations; identify ways for ATCWG and HLPDAB to tap resources for programs; and
- to explore how ATCWG and HLPDAB can better take into account the APEC commitment to give gender greater consideration in accordance with directions outlined by the Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy.

Structure of this Assessment

This assessment is divided into 6 sections which follow the format prescribed by APEC:

- introduction, including purpose of the independent assessment, methods, and a short overview of ATCWG/HLPDAB and their history;
- background, including each group's structure, their terms of reference (ToR) and a summary of key reference documents;
- assessment of each group's alignment with APEC priorities including their performance against their terms of reference and approved strategic plans and work plans;
- assessment of each group's operations, focussing on their efficiency;
- assessment of Cooperation with other APEC Fora and other stakeholders including industry, academia and other multilateral organisations; and
- recommendations and implementation advice

BACKGROUND

Method

The Method is detailed at Appendix B – Method. It included a survey of member economies' delegates to both ATCWG and HLPDAB (summary responses to which are provided in Appendix C – Results of Written Survey); and face-to-face interviews with a number of economy representatives at the ATCWG and HLPDAB meetings in Piura in September 2016 (topics covered in Appendix D – Interviews). Both surveys were developed in consultation with the Program Director for ATCWG/HLPDAB and were approved by the Lead Shepherd for ATCWG and Chair for HLPDAB prior to distribution to delegates. Survey responses were low, with 5 responding from HLPDAB and 6 from ATCWG.

Appendix E – Source Documents includes a list of written sources which provided background to the purpose and activities of both groups. Documents presented to the 2015 and 2016 meeting were also reviewed and relevant statistics from these are referred to in the text. All projects authorised by ATCWG/HLPDAB and included in the APEC Project Database from 2013 – 2016 were included in the review.

The draft independent assessment was submitted to the APEC ATCWG/HLPDAB Project Director, the Lead Shepherd for ATCWG and the Chair for HLPDAB for initial comments on factual matters and then was circulated to delegates from member economies. On finalisation and adoption by APEC, this report will be transmitted to ATCWG and HLPDAB for implementation.

ATCWG

APEC first founded an Experts' Group on Agricultural Technology Cooperation in 1996. After a series of developments, APEC formed the ATCWG in 2000. The primary aim of the ATCWG is to serve as a forum for APEC member economies to enhance the capacity of agriculture and its related industries, to contribute to economic growth, food security and social well-being.

The Senior Officials Meeting in 2010 set the ATCWG the task of serving as a forum for member economies to enhance the capacity of agriculture and its related industries to

contribute to economic growth, food security and social well-being in the region.² Working Group activities were to be focused as follows:

- activities and regional cooperation to strengthen food security in the APEC region;
- conservation and utilization of plant and animal genetic resources;
- research, development and extension of agricultural biotechnology;
- production, processing, marketing, distribution and consumption of agricultural products;
- sanitary and phyto-sanitary (SPS), integrated pest management (IPM), biosecurity, biodiversity, and control of invasive alien species (IAS);
- cooperative development of agricultural finance systems;
- sustainable agriculture and related environmental Issues, including climate change adaptation and mitigation; and
- agricultural investments and trade facilitation

Structure

All 21 member economies of APEC can provide delegates (officials, industry and academic representatives) to ATCWG meetings and can nominate others to participate in ATCWG activities.

There is provision for specific individuals to be accepted as delegates and guests.³ Private sector delegates participating in ATCWG vary from one meeting to another. The standing invited guests for ATCWG are the official observers of APEC⁴ namely APEC Business Advisory Council (ABAC – established to advise APEC on business sector priorities), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (PECC – a partnership of individuals from government, business, academia elsewhere that examines policy issues for the Asia-Pacific in a private capacity) and the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF – the main regional intergovernmental forum in the South Pacific).

Priorities and Outputs

Since 2012, food security has been a major focus of ATCWG, in response to a number of Leaders' statements on this issue and the formation of the Policy Partnership on Food Security (PPFS) in 2011. Significant Leaders' statements include those from the past Ministerial Meetings on Food Security (2010 Niigata Declaration on APEC Food Security, 2012 Kazan Declaration on APEC Food Security, and 2014 Beijing Declaration on APEC Food Security).

ATCWG has one meeting per year. The Executive Summary of each meeting is released shortly after the meeting. Meeting documents are uploaded onto the APEC Collaboration System (ACS) website before the meeting (as available) with the balance uploaded soon after. These documents are not available publicly, although the summary of the meeting and key outcomes are released on the ATCWG's page on the APEC website.⁵

² ATCWG Terms of Reference 2010/SOM3/SCE/025, Agenda Item: 8.1

³ Table 8 lists events associated with ATCWG meetings

⁴ More detail on these can be found at <http://www.apec.org/about-us/how-apec-operates/apec-observers.aspx>

⁵<http://www.apec.org/Home/Groups/SOM-Steering-Committee-on-Economic-and-Technical-Cooperation/Working-Groups/Agricultural-Technical-Cooperation.aspx>

Projects which are sponsored by ATCWG are listed on the public APEC Project Database (Table 1).⁶

Table 1: ATCWG Projects 2013-2016

Project Title	Project Number	Project Year	Proposing Economies
Scientific Workshop on Measurement and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases in Livestock Systems for Green Production and Environment of APEC Members	ATC 01 2013A (complete)	2013	Thailand
Strengthening Public-Private Partnership to Reduce Food Losses in the Supply Chain	M SCE 02 2013A (multi-year, ongoing)	2013	Chinese Taipei
Conference on Enhancing Global Value Chains in Agriculture and Food Sector in Asia-Pacific	ATC 01 2014S (complete)	2014	Japan
Symposium/Workshop on Planning a Collaborative Research, Development and Extension Program on Climate Change among APEC Member Economies	ATC 02 2015S (complete)	2015	Philippines
Food Security Analysis Training and Symposium	ATC 01 2015S	2015	China
High Level Public-Private Forum on Cold Chain to Strengthen Agriculture and Food's Global Value Chain	ATC 01 2014A (complete)	2014	Japan

Source – APEC Project Database, accessed April 2016

Each completed APEC project must publish a completion report. ATCWG publications are listed at Appendix F – ATCWG Publications. There have been 10 reports in the period since ATCWG was formed (8 in 2013, one in 2015 and one (to date) in 2016) – some of these result from projects completed prior to 2013. In 2014, for example, an average of 5 publications was released per working groups,⁷ but the range is significant and it is difficult to rely on only one year's data to comment on whether ATCWG is meeting expectations.

HLPDAB

HLPDAB was formed by APEC in 2001 as an ongoing policy dialogue in recognition of biotechnology's potential benefits to agriculture, and the complexities of its regulatory framework. According to the forum's current work plan, HLPDAB's aim is to exchange information and promote public policy development to support the responsible use and adoption of agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase agricultural productivity, protect the environment and promote food security. As a high level policy dialogue, HLPDAB was created with a primary objective to be a meeting between high-level representatives (at least SOM level), rather than a technical level meeting (as is ATCWG).

⁶ <https://aimp2.apec.org/sites/PDB/FormServerTemplates/BasicSearch.aspx>

⁷ According to SCE, 83 reports were published in 2014, from 15 groups including SCE itself. The range was 1 to 27 reports.

The terms of reference for HLPDAB (2012) name the following objectives:⁸

- to exchange information and promote capacity building regarding the responsible use, development and informed adoption of agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase agricultural productivity, raise farm income, spur economic growth, protect the environment, mitigate and adjust to impacts of climate change, and to strengthen food security in the Asia-Pacific region;
- promote transparent, science-based, and functioning regulatory systems to ensure safety and to facilitate investment in and the development and application of innovative biotechnologies;
- build upon the work of international fora and existing international standards, such as the Codex Alimentarius Commission, to promote greater alignment of national standards with relevant international standards among APEC economies and public confidence in those systems; and
- support outreach and capacity building activities to help achieve above objectives.

HLPDAB had no strategic plan during the period of this review. 2013-2015 HLPDAB work plan sets out activities focussing on harmonization and technical approaches to dealing with global challenges. This includes considering how the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety relates specifically to genetically modified organisms, and how this may contribute to capacity building activities.

Structure

HLPDAB is the only ongoing high level policy dialogue running under APEC. All 21 APEC economies can contribute delegates. The terms of reference for HLPDAB require the Chair of HLPDAB to liaise with ATCWG and the PPFs as part of HLPDAB's operations.

As with ATCWG, standing invited guests include ABAC, ASEAN, PECC and PIF. HLPDAB can also invite guests from organisations interested in the same topics. The World Bank (WB), Asian Development Bank (ADB), Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World Trade Organization (WTO), private industry are listed in the terms of reference as being relevant as potential observers/advisers.

A Private Sector Day, organized by private sector representatives meeting in conjunction with the HLPDAB plenary, is encouraged. HLPDAB has held two private sector days since 2014:

- “Workshop on Plant Biotechnology Life Cycle” hosted by US-APEC Technical Assistance to Advance Regional Integration (US-ATAARI), 14-16 September, 2015; and
- “Forum on the Global Alliance for Agricultural Biotechnology Trade (GAABT) Model Policy on Low-level Presence, GM and Organic Farming Co-existence” hosted by CropLife during the morning of 30 September 2015.

In addition, in September 2016 HLPDAB held a workshop on “Strengthening Innovation and Cooperation Among APEC Economies to Advance Science and Facilitate Trade” (HLPDAB 01 2016T) immediately prior to the main HLPDAB meeting. This was mainly attended by researchers but speakers included representatives from private companies Simplot, CropLife, the Global Alliance for AgBiotech Trade and Pinto Piga Seeds.

⁸ 2012 APEC SOM Report on Economic and Technical Cooperation, Annex 3

Priorities and Outputs

HLPDAB's Work Plan for 2013-15⁹ was agreed at a joint meeting of ATCWG and HLPDAB in 2013 and was approved by SOM in November 2013. It sets two major priority areas:

- Regulatory harmonization: promotion of transparent and functioning regulatory systems to facilitate investment in development, application and transfer of innovative biotechnologies for the benefit of farmers and will build on the work of international fora. This was to be achieved by information sharing in relation to regulatory experiences and promoting consideration of farmers' welfare in technology transfer.
- Technical approaches to global challenges: providing opportunities for member economies to facilitate technology transfer, share information and experiences, in particular regarding food security. This was to be achieved by identifying appropriate biotechnologies, promoting collaborative mechanisms, developing a platform for co-development and transfer of appropriate technologies to benefit small scale farmers and strengthening linkages with ATWCG and PPFS.

From 2016-2018, HLPDAB proposes to continue advancing policy discussion and efforts in

- administration of innovative and emerging agricultural biotechnologies as part of the solution to global challenges e.g. agricultural practices on co-existence of agricultural production systems (conventional, organic and GM crops);
- management of differences between regulatory systems, for example asynchronous and asymmetric approvals of biotech products for trade,¹⁰ harmonisation of regulations on Low Level Presence (LLP) in food and feed and basing this in science, and data transportability (of trial results, between jurisdictions, to streamline approvals); and
- enhancing public awareness and participation e.g. public understanding of advances in animal biotechnology (livestock, fisheries and aquaculture), regulatory experience, and acceptability issues.

HLPDAB has one meeting per year. The terms of reference specify that this should, to the extent practical, be held back to back with ATCWG. In 2016, however, the HLPDAB meeting overlapped with that of ATCWG, and both immediately preceded the PPFS meeting as part of a broader "APEC Food Security Week".

The website of the HLPDAB is <http://www.apec.org/Home/Groups/Other-Groups/Agricultural-Biotechnology.aspx>. Part of it refers to the 2010 Work Plan but it also summarises the outcomes of the 2015 meeting in the Philippines.

As a Policy Dialogue HPDAB is not expected to initiate projects, however the workshops run prior to the HLPDAB meeting provide an effective means of raising issues that are then brought forward to the main HLPDAB meeting. In 2016 the workshop's considerations on LLP and asynchronous approvals were then discussed at HLPDAB in the context of regulatory harmonisation and were placed on the agenda for the 2017 meeting in Viet Nam.

⁹ HLPDAB Work Plan 2013-2015, 2013/SOM/HLPDAB-ATCWG/007

¹⁰ That is, different approval timelines for different traits, which may be stacked in a single product – the product can only reach the market when the last approval is obtained

ALIGNMENT WITH APEC PRIORITIES

A particular focus of the independent assessment ATCWG and HLPDAB could better support APEC's Economic and Technical Cooperation (ECOTECH) priorities and alignment of its activities with Leaders' and Ministerial objectives including the Bogor Goals of 1994. Source documents for this section include work plans and terms of reference from both groups, plus information on projects from the APEC Projects Database and any project completion reports.

It should be noted that HLPDAB has had only a small number of projects (expected as it is a policy dialogue) and none in the review period 2013-2015, although there have been workshops in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016. For 2013 and 2014 the workshops were 1.5 days with the ½ day for the meeting, scheduled back-to-back.

. Hence much of the commentary here uses the work plan as the primary reference source.

Bogor Goals 1994

APEC's 1994 Bogor Goals aim to achieve economic cooperation and growth within APEC by adopting "the long term goal of free and open trade and investment in the Asia – Pacific."¹¹ The Bogor Goals Dashboard¹² summarises these as (removal of) tariffs, reducing costs to export and import, developing free trade agreements, and allowing foreign ownership.

Alignment of ATCWG

ATCWG's projects are focussed on trade in food and agricultural supply chains and in investment in cutting edge technologies particularly those that support sustainability and global food chains. ATCWG's activities focus on technical solutions rather than those which address tariffs, streamlining and non-tariff barriers, although such solutions contribute towards achieving the Bogor goals (e.g. supply impacts of cold chain improvements and waste reduction). Respondents to the survey believed that ATCWG had facilitated dialogue on agricultural issues and enhanced capacity building.

Alignment of HLPDAB

HLPDAB focusses on analysis of trade issues around agricultural biotechnology, in particular the highly regulated genetically modified crop products, and capacity building in this area. Its focus is on greater alignment of national standards with relevant international standards among APEC economies and building public confidence in those systems, rather than free trade, *per se*. Respondents to the survey scored HLPDAB highest in sharing information about agricultural biotechnology and promoting understanding of and participation in regulatory systems.

APEC Leaders' Growth Strategy 2010

The APEC Leaders' Growth Strategy of 2010 groups APEC's key agendas under five headings: balanced growth, inclusive growth, innovative growth, sustainable growth and secure growth.

¹¹ APEC Policy Support Unit (2014): *APEC's Bogor Goals Progress Report*, APEC#214-SE-01.1

¹²

http://www.apec.org/~media/Files/AboutUs/AchievementsBenefits/2014_BG_Dashboards/APEC_BogorGoalsDashboard_August2014.pdf

Alignment of ATCWG

ATCWG's activities align with the growth strategy components outlines by APEC Leaders in 2010 (Table 2). The emphasis of these projects is on balanced growth (capacity building) and innovative growth, with the secondary emphasis being on involvement of all citizens (through public-private partnerships). Most projects, however, address several goals in the Leaders' Growth Strategy.

Three of the seven projects have received central funding from APEC, indicating that APEC considers that the projects align with its goals. The remaining four projects have been self-funded by participating economies following failure to attract central funding.

Table 2: Mapping of Recent ATCWG projects against Leaders' Growth Strategy

Project Title	Balanced Growth	Inclusive Growth	Innovative Growth	Sustainable Growth	Secure Growth
C indicates completed project A indicates APEC funded	Growth within & between economies & infrastructure development	Involvement of all citizens, promote SMEs, entrepreneurship and women's growth	Promoting innovation & emerging sectors	Protection of environment and transition to green economies	Protection of wellbeing; secure environment for economic activity
Scientific Workshop on Measurement and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases in Livestock Systems for Green Production and Environment of APEC Members (C) (A)	✓		✓	✓	
Strengthening Public-Private Partnership to Reduce Food Losses in the Supply Chain (A)	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Conference on Enhancing Global Value Chains in Agriculture and Food Sector in Asia-Pacific (C)	✓	✓	✓		
Symposium/Workshop on Planning a Collaborative Research, Development and Extension Program on Climate Change among APEC Member Economies (C)			✓	✓	✓
Food Security Analysis Training and Symposium		✓	✓		✓
High Level Public-Private Forum on Cold Chain to Strengthen Agriculture and Food's Global Value Chain (C) (A)	✓	✓			✓
Total	4	4	5	3	3

Source – APEC project list (ATCWG projects 2013 to May 2016) and Secretariat

Concept Notes submitted since 2012 have met with only limited success – this is partly because ATCWG is targeting APEC sub-funds which have less (sometimes considerably) than

50% funding success.¹³ Further, ATCWG's Concept Notes were not scored highly by SCE. ATCWG-20 discussed methods to enhance success in project applications, including prospects for further collaboration with other fora including PPFs and PPSTI, and appropriate briefing by delegates of their representatives on SCE.

Alignment of HLPDAB

APEC leaders have made a number of statements about the importance of agricultural biotechnology. The broad approach by HLPDAB falls under the Innovative Growth target of APEC Leaders, as well as protection of the environment (e.g. regulatory frameworks which reduce the chance of increasing weeds and mitigating the negative impact of climate change with drought resistant genetically engineered crops) and growth within and between economies.

ECOTECH Priorities

In 2010 APEC Senior Officials endorsed a new Framework to Guide ECOTECH activities to guide APEC-funded capacity-building and all ECOTECH activities for working groups.¹⁴ Definitions of these are elucidated, in the main, in other APEC documents and are as follows:

- Regional Economic Integration, ensuring that goods, services and people move easily across borders with the focus being on customs, the business environment and aligning regulations and standards;¹⁵
- Addressing The Social Dimensions of Globalisation (inclusive growth), which includes the impact of globalisation on the life and work of people, families and societies through employment, working conditions, income social protection; security, culture and identity, inclusion or exclusion and family/community cohesiveness¹⁶;
- Safeguarding The Quality of Life Through Sustainable Growth, which includes sustainable development of the marine environment, clean technology and clean production, and sustainable cities¹⁷;
- Structural Reform, relating to domestic policies and institutions that affect the operation of markets and the capacity of international businesses to access those markets and operate efficiently including competition policy, regulatory reform, public sector governance, corporate governance and economic and legal infrastructure;¹⁸ and
- Human Security, relating to counter-terrorism, health security, emergency preparedness and energy security¹⁹

¹³ Presentation by APEC Secretariat to the ATCWG meeting, 21 September 2016, Item 5 – Updated Information on APEC project funding and suggestions on how to enhance APEC project cooperation amongst ATCWG member economies, Agenda Item 5

¹⁴ APEC Economic and Technical Cooperation Priorities, final February 2010

¹⁵ <http://www.apec.org/About-Us/About-APEC/Fact-Sheets/Regional-Economic-Integration-Agenda.aspx>

¹⁶ From World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (<http://ilo.org>). Inclusive growth refers to participation of all members and communities in the region through initiatives which enhance human capital development see <http://www.apec.org/About-Us/About-APEC/Fact-Sheets/Inclusive-Growth.aspx>

¹⁷ <http://www.apec.org/Groups/Other-Groups/Sustainable-Development.aspx>

¹⁸ <http://www.apec.org/About-Us/About-APEC/Fact-Sheets/Structural-Reform.aspx>

¹⁹ APEC (2007): *Preliminary Conference for APEC 2007 - 'Reshaping APEC for the Asian Pacific Century – Priorities and Strategies'*, 11 and 12 December 2006, Melbourne, page 5

Alignment of ATCWG

ATCWG-19 endorsed a new five-year strategic plan for 2015-2020.²⁰ This has been mapped against ECOTECH goals in Table 3. The work plan for 2013-15 focuses on establishing and continuing projects that address these goals. ATCWG's activities also align with all but one ECOTECH priority (Table 4) particularly regional economic integration, quality of life and human security.

²⁰ APEC Document 2015/ATCWG/003 Agenda Item 4

Table 3: Mapping of ATCWG 2015-2025 Strategic Plan against ECOTECH Goals

ECOTECH GOALS	ATCWG Strategic Plan	Plan Priorities
Social Dimensions of Globalisation (Inclusive growth) Regional Economic Integration	Promote activities and regional cooperation in APEC Improve agricultural production and distribution through increased use of new tools of science and institutional innovations	Organise at least 3 projects annually (each project must be supported by three economies) Increase in agricultural trade flows among APEC economies Increase in APEC average agricultural production
Quality of Life through sustainable growth	Strengthen Human and institutional resource capacities in agriculture through education and training	10 workshops with 500 participants by 2018 and follow up survey shows 90% of participants used knowledge gained in their jobs 3 major conferences generate 6 major research papers published by APEC and in local journals
Human security Structural reform	Improve agricultural production and distribution through increased use of new tools of science and institutional innovations	New tools of science and innovation Increase in APEC average agricultural production

Source: ATCWG Strategic Plan, Work Plan and author's analysis

Table 4: Mapping of ATCWG Projects against APEC ECOTECH Priorities

Current Project	Regional Ec. Integration	Globalization's Social Dimensions	Safeguarding Quality of Life	Structural Reform	Human Security
Scientific Workshop on Measurement and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases in Livestock Systems for Green Production and Environment of APEC Members	✓		✓		✓
Strengthening Public-Private Partnership to Reduce Food Losses in the Supply Chain	✓		✓		✓
Conference on Enhancing Global Value Chains in Agriculture and Food Sector in Asia-Pacific	✓			✓	
Symposium/Workshop on Planning a Collaborative Research, Development and Extension Program on Climate Change among APEC Member Economies	✓		✓		✓
Food Security Analysis Training and Symposium			✓		✓
High Level Public-Private Forum on Cold Chain to Strengthen Agriculture and Food's Global Value Chain	✓				
Total	5	0	4	1	4

Source – APEC project list (ATCWG projects 2013 to mid-2015) and Secretariat

Both the work plan and the projects undertaken by ATCWG align strongly with APEC's ECOTECH priorities. The agenda for ATCWG-20 also demonstrated alignment with these goals by addressing innovations to reduce food losses in the supply chain.

However, measurement of progress towards the objective goals set out in the strategic plan was not apparent during ACTWG-20.

Respondents to the survey listed the main barriers to meeting ECOTECH goals as lack of APEC funding for ATCWG projects, followed by lack of engagement with other APEC fora, lack of support from ABAC and lack of self-funding.

Alignment of HLPDAB

HLPDAB's focus is considered to be regional economic integration (through regulatory alignment), sustainable growth (many genetic modifications aim to reduce use of pesticides) and structural reform (capacity building in biotechnology regulation).

HLPDAB has a work plan but has no strategic plan which covers the period of this review – a new Strategic Plan has been approved for 2016-2018. Table 5 therefore maps the goals of the 2013-2015 Work Plan against ECOTECH Goals.

Table 5: Mapping of 2013-2015 Work Plan against ECOTECH Goals

ECOTECH GOALS	HLPDAB Work Plan	Focus
Social Dimensions of Globalisation (Inclusive growth)	Promote transparent and functioning regulatory systems and regulatory harmonization Provide opportunities for member economies to facilitate technology transfer	Emphasise farmers' welfare as a consideration in transferring innovative technology Develop Platform for Co-Development and transfer of appropriate innovative technology to benefit small scale farmers
Regional Economic Integration	Promote transparent and functioning regulatory systems and regulatory harmonization Provide opportunities for member economies to facilitate technology transfer	Share information, promote understanding Strengthen linkage with other APEC fora for food security (ATCWG and PPFS)
Quality of Life through sustainable growth	Provide opportunities for member economies to facilitate technology transfer	Identify applications of agricultural biotechnology that meet new environmental, and food and energy demand challenges Promote mechanisms for collaboration and sharing of information and experiences
Human security and Structural reform	Provide opportunities for member economies to facilitate technology transfer	Develop Platform for Co-Development and transfer of appropriate innovative technology to benefit small scale farmers

Source: HLPDAB Work Plan and author's analysis

While HPDAB's activities align with APEC's ECOTECH Goals, the agenda for HLPDAB-16 was strongly focussed on regional economic integration, with discussions on low level presence (LLP) and data transfer. Respondents to the survey highlighted asynchronous and asymmetric approvals of biotech products for trade, and coordination systems.

Respondents to the survey listed the main barriers to meeting ECOTECH goals as lack of APEC funding for HLPDAB projects, followed by lack of self-funding and lack of engagement of HLPDAB with other fora.

APEC Tasking Statement for 2015

ATCWG activities against APEC Tasking Statement

APEC’s Tasking Statement for 2015 required ATCWG to address food safety and security and agricultural biotechnologies (Table 6). Many of the Leaders’ items were also directed to the PPFS. ATCWG’s activities align strongly with activities directed by the Tasking Statement

Table 6: ATCWG Initiatives Mapped Against the APEC 2015 Tasking Statement

Tasking Statement Requirement	Relevant ATCWG initiatives
Enhance capacity building in food security and sustainable agriculture [also PPFS]	Workshop on mitigation of livestock greenhouse gases
Progress work to enhance food security through the development of food value chains, and continue joint efforts by member economies to reduce food loss [also PPFS]	Public-private partnerships to reduce food losses in the supply chain; public-private forum on cold chain
Build and strengthen an open, inclusive, mutually beneficial and all-win partnership for the long term food security of the Asia-Pacific region [also PPFS]	Public-private partnerships to reduce food losses in the supply chain; workshop on collaborative R&D for climate change
Continue efforts of the Food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF) and its Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN) in developing robust food safety systems in APEC member economies	Food security training
Commit to strengthening APEC agricultural science and technology innovation and cooperation with a view to facilitating trade-related agricultural products and promoting sustainable agricultural development; encourage the use of agricultural science and technology research in a market-oriented manner to improve food and security in the region [also HLPDAB]	Scientific workshop on livestock greenhouse gases, workshop on collaborative R&D in climate change, public-private partnership to reduce losses along the supply chain and cold chain strengthening forum
Reiterate pledge against protectionism, recognising that bans and other restrictions on food exports may cause price volatility, especially for economies that rely on imports of staple products [also PPFS]	Secondary interest from conference on enhancing global value chains

Respondents to the ATCWG survey felt that ATCWG was on average doing well in meeting the goals set out in the Tasking Statement.

HLPDAB Activities against APEC 2015 Tasking Statement

HLPDAB’s obligations under APEC’s Tasking Statement for 2015 were restricted to agricultural biotechnologies (Table 6): “commit to strengthening APEC agricultural science and technology innovation and cooperation with a view to facilitating trade-related agricultural products and promoting sustainable agricultural development; encourage the use of agricultural science and technology research in a market-oriented manner to improve food and security in the region.” HLPDAB’s activities align with this obligation.

Respondents to the HLPDAB survey felt that HLPDAB was on average doing well in meeting the goals set out in the Tasking Statement.

Other APEC Food and Agricultural Priorities

APEC Ministerial Meetings on Food Security

APEC Ministers responsible for Food Security met with representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the World Bank (WB), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the APEC Business Advisory Council (ABAC) in Russia in 2012.

The resulting Kazan Declaration reaffirmed APEC economies' intentions to collectively pursue the shared goals of (i) sustainable development of the agricultural sector, and (ii) facilitation of investment, trade and markets in the 2010 Niigata Declaration on Food Security. The Kazan Declaration agreed to focus on the following issues: increasing agricultural production and productivity; facilitating trade and developing food markets; enhancing food safety and quality; improving access to food for socially vulnerable groups of population; and ensuring sustainable ecosystems based management and combating Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing and associated trade.

Both ATCWG's and HLPDAB's activities align with the objectives laid out in the Kazan Declaration in that they focus on increasing production and improve trade through their focus on supply chain and associated regulatory issues. ATCWG supports enhancement of food safety and quality through their work on food security and they improve sustainability through the work on greenhouse gas mitigation.

The Policy Partnership on Food Security (PPFS)

The APEC Policy Partnership on Food Security (PPFS) was established in 2011 following APEC's Niigata Declaration, Japan 2010. The Niigata Declaration was the first comprehensive APEC plan for promoting regional food security.

In this context, food security relates to both demand issues (price volatility and population growth) and supply issues (natural resource constraints, urbanisation, climate and weather effects).²¹ PPFS aims to help economies develop a food system that would provide lasting regional food security by 2020.

The Beijing Declaration (2014) outlined APEC's new plans for tackling food security. This declaration prioritised issues under three major headings:

- Boosting agricultural productivity and food production and availability based on sustainable development, innovation, science and technology and an enabling economic environment;
- Improving post-harvest management to reduce food loss; and
- Strengthening regional cooperation to promote food security.

APEC SOM approved PPFS's APEC Food Security Roadmap Towards 2020.²² This document reiterates the overall goals of the PPFS but sets a hard target of reducing waste by 10% by 2020 compared to 2011-12 levels. This document aggregates objectives under five key topics

²¹ <http://www.apec.org/Groups/Other-Groups/Policy-Partnership-on-Food-Security.aspx>

²² APEC Food Security Roadmap Towards 2020 (Version 2014 Draft Track) 2014/SOM3/PPFS/008

– sustainable development, facilitating infrastructure development, enhancing trade and markets, reducing food loss and waste and improving safety and nutrition.²³

ATCWG's and HLPDAB's work, both exclusively land-based,²⁴ support the work of the PPFs as expressed in its strategy and through the Roadmap. Both groups are focussed on regional cooperation (enhancing regional supply chains). ATCWG's wider remit encompasses food security and post-harvest management (reduction of food losses and training in food security) and climate change (livestock greenhouse gases, but more environmentally-focussed than production-focussed). ATCWG appears to pay little attention to infrastructure development.

APEC Gender Agenda

A specific focus of the review's terms of reference was to identify how ATCWG and HLPDAB can better take into account the APEC commitment to give gender greater consideration in accordance with directions outlined by the Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy. APEC Ministers issued a statement on advancing gender equality in 2014,²⁵ highlighting a course of action on women and green development, women and regional trade/economic cooperation, and policy support for women's empowerment.

Neither ATCWG nor HLPDAB specifically address gender issues in their planning documents,. However, presentations at ATCWG did address gender issues as well as related Micro and Small to Medium Enterprise (MSME) issues ("small farm-holdings") and showed awareness of the relevance of these to its work. There are efforts to invite female participants to workshops.

While HLPDAB's policy focus is more relevant to larger private sector organisations (as holders of much of the intellectual property in GM arenas) the reports of field trials presented at the meeting and the preceding workshop did discuss the impact of genetically modified technologies on MSMEs, without discussion of gender issues.

Further, the survey respondents did not rank gender issues, or a relationship with the APEC Working Group on Women and the Economy (PPWE), highly, with over half the respondents to both surveys listing PPWE as not applicable to their work.

The work of both groups would benefit form more overt recognition of gender issues in their planning documents, as relevant.

Conclusions

ATCWG

ATCWG has met the following requirements:

1. ATCWG's APEC-funded and self-funded projects align with the Leaders' Growth strategy, with a preponderance of activity mapping on to balanced growth and the involvement of all citizens (the latter emphasising public-private partnerships).
2. ATCWG's projects align with ECOTECH priorities, with most emphasis on regional integration, safeguarding quality of life and human security. There is no effort allocated to globalisations' social dimensions and a limited amount to structural reform.

²³ *ibid* page 4

²⁴ The Oceans and Fisheries Working Group is concerned with marine and freshwater resources

²⁵ http://www.apec.org/Press/News-Releases/2014/0526_gender.aspx

3. ATCWG addresses the food security issues allocated to it in the recent APEC Tasking Statements.

ATCWG's activities do not align significantly with the Bogor Goals, which focus on free and open trade – its activities are more focussed on technical issues rather than tariffs and non-tariff barriers. This is considered appropriate given the ATCWG's terms of reference.

Little overt attention is paid to APEC's gender agenda, either through actions from the Tasking Statement for 2015 or specifically in projects.

ATCWG's Strategic Plan sets measurable goals that can objectively identify when the impact of this plan is assessed. Its projects provide a focus for activities and flow naturally from its overall strategic plan and resulting work plan. It is not clear, however, how the Strategic Plan derives from the Terms of Reference, for example:

1. The terms of reference refer to conservation and utilisation of plant and animal genetic resources, as well as sustainable agriculture and related environmental issues, but strategic plan refers only to improving environmental and natural resource management.
2. There is no reference in the strategic plan to cooperative development of agricultural financial systems despite this being a key Term of Reference
3. While the terms of reference refer to both plant and animal agriculture, there was no reference to any animal-based agriculture at ATCWG-20

ATCWG would also benefit from putting into place a more formal reporting process so that each meeting is in a position to assess progress towards the goals in the strategic plan.

HLPDAB

HLPDAB has met the following requirements:

1. HLPDAB aligns strongly with the Bogor goals on analysis of trade issues around agricultural biotechnology, in particular the highly regulated genetically modified crop products, and capacity building in this area. Its focus is on alignment of regulatory frameworks rather than free trade, *per se*.
2. HLPDAB's broad goals align with the Innovative Growth component of the Leaders' Growth strategy
3. HLPDAB's activities can be mapped successfully onto all APEC's ECOTECH priorities,
4. HLPDAB addresses the agricultural biotechnology activities identified in recent APEC Tasking Statements

As already noted, HLPDAB did not have a strategic plan spanning the period of this review and instead has approved a work plan. HLPDAB's performance against the work plan is strongly supported by respondents to the survey.

HLPDAB has approved a Strategic Plan for 2016-2018. This document is structured against the first two of its terms of reference but fails to acknowledge the remaining two (regarding Codex Alimentarius and outreach/capacity building, although the latter is partly dealt with by a separate goal on intra-APEC communication). This Strategic Plan is still activity-based and fails to identify measurable outcomes.

FORUM OPERATIONS

This section covers operational issues that contribute to the ability of ATCWG and HLPDAB to meet their objectives.

Pre-meeting management and documentation

The APEC Collaboration System (ACS) hosts documents for each meeting. While the standard guideline requires submission of papers 10 working days ahead of the meeting, documents sometimes arrive late. Documents are, however, uploaded to the collaboration system within 24 hours of receipt. Documents may also be tabled at the meeting and are uploaded to the APEC Meeting Document Database (MDDB) after the event.

The Lead Shepherd/Chair of both groups lead the collective work on the agenda and any economy can submit documents. Documents are clearly marked “for information” or “for consideration”. Where endorsement (following consideration) is required, delegations must act on behalf of their economy. This sometimes leads to further amendment, and delays in endorsement.

The agenda is circulated in draft some weeks before the meeting, and in final form shortly before the meeting. There were 10 documents provided for 9 agenda items at HLPDAB-16 and 19 documents for 12 agenda items at ATCWG-20 . Most of these were provided prior to the meeting.

ATCWG holds a pre-meeting for heads of delegations the day before its main meeting, so that any agenda issues can be raised prior to the main meeting. In 2016, only 8 delegations attended this pre-meeting, likely because of the clash in timing with HLPDAB which was still being held. For this reason, the ATCWG pre-meeting was not effective in finalising the agenda.

HLPDAB’s board did not meet prior to the 2016 meeting.

Meetings

Economies can bring delegations of any size. These can range from one person to over 20 people. There is room at the main table for only 2-3 people per economy. Generally, the host economy takes the opportunity to bring additional delegates from local industry and institutions (e.g. the Philippines delegation in 2015 numbered almost 200).

Both HLPDAB and ATCWG meet in plenary sessions, both of which commence with introductory remarks, confirmation of the agenda and consideration of the work plans. Both meetings also conclude with presentation of a draft summary statement which summarised key statements, plenary and sub-group discussions, endorsements (e.g. to the strategic plan) and intersessional actions, including a timetable to finalised the full minutes.

PPSTI-20 and HLPDAB-16 followed their allotted agendas and covered all agenda items. Respondents to the HLPDAB survey noted that the number of documents provided for meetings I manageable, that the structure of the meetings is well match to the aim of the group and that meetings run to time.

Respondents to the survey noted no concerns evident around meeting planning and associated documentation.

Attendance

A total of 71 delegates from 13 economies attended ATCWG-19 , with just under 20% from the host economy of the Philippines. A total of 103 delegates from 15 economies attended HLPDAB-15 meeting, with just over 40% of these from the host economy. Australia, Republic of Korea, and Malaysia sent delegates to HLPDAB but not to ATCWG; Singapore sent a delegate to ATCWG but not to HLPDAB; and Brunei Darussalam, Hong Kong, China, Mexico, Papua New Guinea and Russia did not send a delegate to either (Table 7).

Table 7: Attendance at 2015 meetings

Economy	HLPDAB-15	ATCWG-19
Australia	Grain Trade Australia	<i>Did not attend</i>
Canada	Agriculture and Agri-food Canada	Agriculture and Agri-food Canada
Chile	Bureau of Agricultural Studies and Policy from Ministry of Agriculture	Bureau of Agricultural Studies and Policy (Ministry of Agriculture)
Indonesia	Ministry of Agriculture, Indonesian Centre for Agricultural Biotechnology, Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries, Indonesian Agency for Agricultural Research and Development	Indonesian Centre for Agricultural Biotechnology
Japan	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Malaysia	Malaysia Agricultural Research and Development Institute	<i>Did not attend</i>
New Zealand	Ministry for Primary Industries	Ministry for Primary Industries
People's Republic of China	State Administration of Grain	Agriculture Ministry, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences, State Administration of Grain
Peru	National Institute of Agricultural Innovation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	National Institute of Agricultural Innovation
The Philippines (host)	Department of Agriculture, several universities and R&D centres, private companies and industry associations	Department of Agriculture, Philippine Council for Agriculture and Fisheries, several universities and R&D centres
Republic of Korea	Rural Development Administration	<i>Did not attend</i>
Singapore	<i>Did not attend</i>	Agri-food and Veterinary Authority
Chinese Taipei	Livestock Research Institute	National Taiwan University, Council of Agriculture
Thailand	Department of Agriculture	Cooperative Auditing Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Kasetstart University
United States	US Embassy Office of Agricultural Affairs, Department of Agriculture, private	US Embassy Office of Agricultural Affairs

	companies	
Viet Nam	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Source: Attendance lists from HLPDAB and ATCWG Meetings, 2015

In 2016, 80 delegates from 20 economies attended the 2016 HLPDAB Workshop which preceded the meeting in Piura; however only 11 economies then attended the main HLPDAB meeting.²⁶ In 2016, 16 economies attended the ATCWG meeting, also in Piura. Both the HLPDAB and ATCWG meetings were held as part of Food Security Week and preceded meetings of the PPFs and the Food Security Ministerial Meeting.

The previous Independent Assessment for HLPDAB commented on the expectation, at the time, that “high level” meant Ministerial. There is still some confusion about the appropriate level of representation, with some economies moving instead to technical representatives and, according to interviewees, some sending inexperienced representatives who did not seem to understand the purpose of the meeting and the APEC Protocols. This is considered inappropriate given the policy focus of the HLPDAB. The appropriate level of representation is by policy departments/organisations with knowledge of the regulatory framework and economies should be encouraged to send appropriate representatives.

Timing

The potential for overlap, or at least complementarity, between HLPDAB and ATCWG is recognised by the intention to hold their meetings “back to back”.²⁷ This was not achieved in 2016, with ATCWG’s planning meeting being held during the Day 1 Plenary meeting of HLPDAB, its first morning session being held during HLPDAB’s Day 2 morning plenary meeting.

This overlap in timing had the effect of reducing the effectiveness of the ACTWG delegates’ planning meeting as delegates chose to attend HLPDAB rather than the latter. It also halved the number of economies present for the morning session of the one-day ATCWG Meeting, as delegates attended the final session of the HLPDAB meeting in preference to attending ATCWG.

Joint sessions

In order to aid co-ordination between the two groups, ATCWG-17 (Medan, Indonesia) resolved to hold joint sessions to identify cross cutting areas in agricultural biotechnology. This was managed on 2016 by inviting the Chair of HLPDAB to report a summary of deliberations to the ATCWG meeting. However, while the Chair of HLPDAB presented to the ACTWG, there was no discussion and this part of the agenda was allocated only 15 minutes. There was no discussion of how the issues addressed by HLPDAB affected or engaged with those to be addressed by ATCWG.

²⁶This is understood to be due to the fact that economies can obtain APEC funding to attend workshops but not forum meetings – thus attendees at the HLPDAB workshop who had received APEC travel funds would lose this funding if they had also attended the main HLPDAB meeting. It might also be expected that economies would send different delegates to a workshop aimed at capacity building vs the main meeting which discussed policy, if those topics were dealt with by different parts of their domestic government agencies.

²⁷ For example, as stated in the HLPDAB Terms of Reference considered at their 2014 meeting. This was referred to in the previous evaluation of HLPDAB and ATCWG, which recommended a greater emphasis on engagement.

ATCWG-20 allowed for a presentation by HLPDAB to ATCWG. Protocol demands that this be the Chair. The sessions, however, was simply a reporting of what had happened at HLPDAB with no allowance for discussion and no attempt to incorporate the issues into ATCWG's agenda discussions, i.e. it did not fulfil the engagement mandate that was sought in the previous evaluation. This the value of this reporting session was therefore limited and it is considered that such as session be expanded to provide a deeper consideration of how the issues raised in HLPDAB affected ATCWG's agenda (and vice versa). This issue was also raised by interviewees.

Project initiation, funding and management

Most of ATCWG's work plan is implemented through projects, and HLPDAB is attempting to initiate projects. A Concept Note for each new project is developed and then submitted to ATCWG or HLPDAB for approval. Proponents of projects must follow broad APEC guidelines and proposal format²⁸ when proposing projects. The Concept Note must justify the project against broad APEC objectives (including gender), explain how the project will meet APEC's key priorities, explain the method, beneficiaries and provide a communications plan.²⁹

Project Concept Notes are submitted for funding from APEC and are initially prioritised by SCE and then the APEC Budget and Management Committee. Larger projects may also be considered by SOM. Those which are accepted through initial screening are then invited to submit full proposals. The end point of a project is a report, which includes an evaluation of success using a range of metrics, which might include attendance, gender split and audience feedback for a workshop; or a policy outcome such as impact on domestic regulation.

During 2016, ATCWG submitted 14 Concept Notes and was only funded for one project, largely due to low scoring of these Concept Notes by SCE. Mechanisms to overcome this low success rate were discussed at the meeting and included collaboration with PPFS and PPSTI, focussing Concept Notes towards APEC sub-funds which have higher rates of success, and appropriately briefing SCE economy representatives by ATCWG members .

During 2016, HLPDAB-16 submitted 3 project Concept Notes and received funding for one project – Strengthening Innovation and Cooperation among APEC Economies to Advance Science and Facilitate Trade (led by the United States and co-sponsored by Mexico, Canada and Peru). This culminated in a very successful two-day workshop held before HLPDAB-16. Mechanisms to strengthen Concept Notes were also discussed at the HLPDAB meeting.

Communication

The Program Director in the Secretariat is the central point through which information flows (mainly by email) in between meetings. The Chair/Lead Shepherd's office also provides secretariat support. The Program Director will also attempt to keep delegates/economies up to date on other issues related to group activities during the year.

The current Program Director has been in place since 2015 and provides support to ATCWG, HLPDAB and PPFS – this also provides opportunity for continuity and information flow between the groups.

The APEC website (www.apec.org) has dedicated pages for both HLPDAB and ATCWG. ATCWG's page is up to date up to the meeting in the Philippines in 2015. The reference to the Chair is incorrect (Mr rather than Dr) but otherwise the page is comprehensive. HLPDAB's page is up to date and reports on events in 2015 and the planned meeting in 2016.

²⁸ Guidebook on APEC projects, Edition 9

²⁹ Ibid, Appendix B

Structure and Operations

ATCWG

ATCWG complies with the Revised Guidelines for Lead Shepherd and Deputy Lead Shepherd of APEC Working Groups and SOM Task Forces.³⁰ The ATCWG's Lead Shepherd is a voluntary position and has been occupied by China for three terms (6 years). This has provided good continuity despite ATCWG holding only one meeting annually. At ATCWG-20, Peru took the role of Deputy Lead Shepherd as host economy.

At this meeting, China indicated its intention to step down from the Lead Shepherd role. However, as there was no economy willing to provide the Lead Shepherd for two years, ATCWG-20 proposed to amend the Terms of Reference to adopt a rotating chairmanship to host economy and possibly a troika system. The aim is to create continuity despite the Chair's role only being occupied for one year. The Terms of Reference need to be amended to reflect this change and will be submitted to SOM for approval in November 2016.

Again in line with APEC practice, the host economy rotates annually, being the Philippines in 2015, Peru in 2016 and Viet Nam in 2016. At ATCWG-20 Viet Nam announced that the ATCWG meeting in 2017 would be held in Can Tho, southern Viet Nam, in August 2017.

ATCWG meeting history is summarised in Table 8.

Table 8: ATCWG Meeting History

Meeting	No. economies	Guests	Associated Events
ACTWG-16, Kazan, Russian Federation (28 May 2012)	19		
ATCWG-17, Medan, Indonesia (29 June 2013)	17		
ATCWG-18, Beijing, China (16 September 2014)	15		Workshop as part of multi-year project on strengthening public private partnerships to reduce food loss
ATCWG-19, Iloilo, the Philippines (28-29 September 2015)	13		Workshop as part of multi-year project on strengthening public private partnerships to reduce food loss
ATCWG-20, Piura, Peru (21-22 September 2016)	16	CIP, HLPDA B	Workshop as part of multi-year project on strengthening public private partnerships to reduce food loss

Source – APEC documents and ATCWG Secretariat

Except for 2015, ATCWG has met the attendance requirements for working groups (that is, annual attendance by 14 or more economies). While attendance at its meeting fell from 2012 to 2015, numbers rebounded in 2016.

³⁰ 2012/SOM1/SCE-COW/004

Respondents to the survey ranked 8 of the 11 efficiency measures as good or better, with the remainder ranked between neutral and good – the lowest scoring related to funding for working group projects.

HLPDAB

As it reports to the SCE, HLPDAB has a Chair rather than a Lead Shepherd. The Chair has rotated annually and has been held by the host economy. Interviewees expressed the view that this is unnecessarily disruptive and there was some support for the idea of having a Chair for two years. It is noted that the terms of reference currently allow for appointing a Deputy Chair from the following year’s host economy (e.g. in 2016 the Deputy Chair could have been from Viet Nam, which is the host economy for 2017); however while this would enhance continuity it has not been implemented. This was partly because HLPDAB holds only one meeting per year, so each meeting is chaired by a different economy. The idea of running two meetings annually was raised but was not supported by survey respondents. Indeed, the declining numbers at the HLPDAB meetings would suggest that attaining a quorum for more than one meeting per year may be difficult (Table 9).

Table 9: HLPDAB Meeting History

Meeting	No. economies	Guests	Associated Events
HLPDAB-15, Kazan, Russian Federation (28 May 2012)	14		
HLPDAB-16, Medan, Indonesia (29 June 2013)	16		Regulatory Issues on Emerging Agricultural Technologies
HLPDAB-17, Beijing, China (16 September 2014)	16		Workshop: Plant Biotechnology Lifecycle
HLPDAB-18, Iloilo, the Philippines (28-29 September 2015)	13		Fostering the Benefits of Innovation in Plant Breeding and Science Communication
HLPDAB-19, Piura, Peru (21-22 September 2016)	11	CIP, HLPDA B	Workshop on Strengthening Innovation and Cooperation Among APEC Economies to Advance Science and Facilitate Trade

Source – APEC documents and HLPDAB Program Director

The APEC Reform Stocktake of 2006 stated that:³¹

“sub-fora/WGs/TFs should not attract a quorum of less than 14 at two consecutive meetings. Secretariat to collate information and report to CTI/SCE/SOM. SOM may seek decision of higher authority on disbandment/merger and/or withdrawal of rights to propose APEC-funded projects. SOM will be responsible for merger/abolishment of TFs and may submit its recommendations to AMM for endorsement”

³¹ APEC Reform Stocktake, submitted to Informal Meeting of Senior Officials Queensland, Australia, 4 August 2006 Forum Doc No.: 2003/ISOM/005

This follows consideration of reforms at the 2004 APEC Ministerial Meeting, at which it was stated that “Fora that do not attract a quorum at two consecutive meetings will cease to exist”.³² HLPDAB has not met the attendance requirements in the last two years with 11 economies attending in 2016 and 13 in 2015.

Respondents to the survey ranked 8 of the 10 efficiency measures as good or better, with the remainder ranked between neutral and good – the lowest scoring related to funding for working group projects.

Conclusions

The APEC Collaboration System is being used effectively to distribute documents prior to meetings. Communication around meetings is good, but public communication could be enhanced with more attention paid to keeping the website up to date.

Plenary sessions are considered suitable for both groups. The reduction in attendance for HLPDAB is of concern and the suggestion to increase the number of meetings is not supported.

The overlap in timetabling is causing problems and if the two fora continue then it is essential that there is no overlap between their meetings, assuming that economies continue to send common delegates. It would be preferable, however, for economies to send delegates with skills specific to the agendas, which may necessitate sending different delegate to each meeting.

Both groups have had limited success with recent project applications. Projects appear to be necessary to help focus the agendas of both groups but in both cases project development is centred on responding to proposals from economies rather than directing project formulation against Terms of Reference and APEC’s broader priorities. A more pro-active approach (e.g. through a “call for proposals”) would enable both groups to better focus and more efficiently and effectively manage their tasks and ensure activities are providing benefits according to Leaders’ and Ministers’ priorities. ATCWG in particular would benefit from identifying a broader range of potential APEC sub-funds and a greater awareness of potential synergies with in development of project proposals.

Operations comply with APEC policies. The operation of the Secretariat appears to be efficient and is strongly supported by survey respondents.

The continuation of ATCWG is supported, not in the least because it is the only APEC agricultural forum that is specifically focussing on the needs of small landholders, and therefore has a potentially large role in APEC’s MSME agenda. However the troika system to be introduced will need to be monitored for effectiveness given the ATCWG has only one meeting per year. It is noted that the current Lead Shepherd (Republic of China) is strongly of the view that this will be effective and will provide an opportunity for more member economies to play an active role in the group.

Despite low numbers of attendees over recent years, HLPDAB’s remit is clearly non-overlapping with that of ATCWG and there are major issues to be addressed – thus, continuation of HLPDAB as a separate entity is also supported, provided a quorum is met in 2017. Should economies fail to support HLPDAB in 2017 (i.e. fail to send delegates), APEC should reallocate HLPDAB’s work to another group – given HLPDAB’s status as a policy partnership, PPFS is the most suitable candidate for this.

³² *APEC Reform - Reforms for Immediate Action*, 16th APEC Ministerial Meeting, Santiago, Chile, 17-18 November 2004 Forum Doc. No.: 2004/CSOM/025rev1

Timetables need to allow for more substantive joint sessions (as occurred in Medan Indonesia), or at least for the Chair of HLPDAB to attend a substantive session of ATCWG. Agendas need to have room for discussion of cross-cutting issues, identification of which issues should be addressed where, and agreement on which forum is taking the lead on specific items.

COOPERATION

This section explores cooperation by ATCWG and HLPDAB with other APEC fora. The assessment was also required to identify opportunities for greater collaboration with non-APEC parties, including the private sector, civil society and other international organizations; and ways for ATCWG/HLPDAB to tap resources for their projects.

Relationship between HLPDAB, ATCWG and PPFS

ATCWG and HLPDAB both focus on agriculture and food security. However, HLPDAB specifically considers biotechnology products and their regulation, whereas ATCWG has a broader mandate. While there are overlaps in the remit for both ATCWG and HLPDAB, the most recent evaluation of both groups recommended that they remain separate.³³ This evaluation preceded the establishment of the Policy Partnership for Food Security (PPFS).

PPFS was founded in 2012 and its efficiency and effectiveness have not yet been evaluated. APEC has specifically recognised the potential for overlap (and possible duplication) between HLPDAB and ATCWG by requiring them to be evaluated in parallel. No such suggestion has been made for PPFS however the potential overlaps have become apparent. While a review of PPFS is outside the scope of this report, these issues are touched on here for future reference.

From a brief analysis of terms of reference, it can be seen that there are overlaps in the broad areas covered by all three groups, but differences in emphasis (Table 10). ATCWG and HLPDAB both take a more technical view as might be expected. The main gap is in the specific focus by PPFS on women, and the lack of any reference to women in the Terms of Reference of the other two groups – this is discussed later.

Table 10: Potential Overlaps between PPFS, ATCWG and HLPDAB

PPFS ToR Items	ATCWG ToR focus	HLPDAB ToR focus
Promote food supply, production and marketing domestically and globally	Economic and technical cooperation for agriculture and food	Biotech to support agricultural productivity
Trading systems and facilitation	Global value chains and regional cooperation	Transparent science-based regulatory systems
Agricultural research, extension and education	Research, development and extension	Awareness of genetically modified (GM) organisms
New and existing technology development	Production, processing	Biotech only
Inclusive growth including access by women	Broadly, economic production	Broadly, biotech to spur economic growth
Role of public and private sectors	Cold chain, waste management	Informed adoption of biotech

³³ Ramage, C (2012): Independent Assessment of the Agricultural Technology Working Group and High Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology, APEC#212-ES-01.5

Agricultural investment and finance	Cooperative development of agricultural financial systems	Regulatory systems to support investment (e.g. re LLP, data transfer)
Climate change with focus on agriculture	Sustainable agriculture	Mitigate effects using biotechnology
Issues that support food security	Conservation and utilisation of plant and animal genetic resources	Yes, broadly
Food insecurity	Sanitary/phytosanitary issues, integrated pest management, biosecurity, biodiversity and control of pests	Genetic diversity, and reducing negative impacts of climate change

Source: Terms of reference for each group, author's analysis

The Chair of HLPDAB presented a summary of HLPDAB-16 to PPFS' plenary session. There was no similar presentation by ATCWG.

Respondents to the survey commented on the potential overlaps between HLPDAB, ATCWG and PPFS. HLPDAB respondents felt the relationship with PPFS and ATCWG was quite important, scoring them as an average of 3.6 and 3.8 respectively (out of 5 – 5 is highest). Respondents commented on common goals between PPFS and HLPDAB, and the role of biotechnology in agriculture. ATCWG respondents on the other hand rated the relationship with HLPDAB as less important (3.5) but scored the relationship with PPFS as very important (4.7).

Cooperation with other APEC Fora

Respondents to the survey were asked to rank a list of other APEC Fora that could be relevant to the work of their group but were not yet collaborators. Many respondents to this question listed all but a few APEC fora as Not Applicable (see Appendix).

ATCWG respondents ranked ABAC as the most important APEC forum with which it did not yet have a relationship. All the others listed in the question were ranked relatively low.

The top ranked suggestions from the HLPDAB respondents were ABAC, the Human Resources Development Working Group (HRDWG) and the APEC sub-committee on Standards and Conformance (SCSC). The only suggestion forthcoming was a joint meeting between HRDWG and HLPDAB.

Cooperation with other Stakeholders

Academia

Academia are linked with ATCWG and HLPDAB through the workshops run by both groups. These provide a significant opportunity to share information and raise relevant issues.

Private sector

Representatives of the private sector were evident at the ATCWG workshop, primarily as speakers, and technical visits included a tour of a local Piura-based fruit packing company. HLPDAB also has significant involvement of the private sector through past private sector days and involvement of industry in the 2016 workshop.

The survey (Question 12) asked for indications of support for a number of models of industry/SME engagement, with the most favoured for both groups non-APEC' parties participation in workshops and connections with non-APEC associations. HLPDAB respondents also indicated some limited support for specific engagement with women in

business/industry organisations. There was no support for non-APEC parties leading HLPDAB workshops or their involvement in the annual work plan.

Cooperation with Other International Organizations

While there are spaces at the table for representatives of FAO, PIF etc these do not appear to be active participants in either group. There was some discussion at the meeting about learning from other for a, particularly the OECD's waste initiatives.

Conclusions

There is little potential overlap between PPFS and HLPDAB. However, there is considerable potential overlap between PPFS and ATCWG. ATCWG needs to actively approach PPFS for joint activities including development of Concept Notes that enable the groups to work together while meeting their own objectives.

The limited opportunities identified for cross-fora collaboration by ATCWG members indicates that they view their remit rather narrowly. While ATCWG's terms of reference refer to science-based activities, science is broad and can encompass manufacturing, life sciences (conservation), information technology, energy, SME issues etc etc. A broader perspective on the ATCWG's role would open economies' up to thinking more about potential joint projects which could apply for funding from a greater range of APEC sub-funds. Economies, in turn, could also think more broadly about the composition of their delegations in order to tap into a wider range of expertise in relation to the ATCWG agenda. Both HLPDAB and ATCWG need to think more broadly about their remit and the opportunity to work more closely with other APEC fora.

There are particular opportunities with the following:

1. SMEWG – in relation to ATCWG's interest in small landholders, and the differential roles of large technology producers vs smaller technology users in agricultural biotechnology. SMEWG and ABAC are both focussed on facilitating micro and small to medium enterprise (MSME) development and their access to global markets and new technologies
2. PPWE – in order to overtly engage with APEC's gender agenda, and also in relation to small landholders and ATCWG's agenda
3. PPFS – both HLPDAB and ATCWG have agendas which feed into that of PPFS. It is essential that they are both visible to PPFS and also understand PPFS' approach so that they add value to it. This could be achieved by ATCWG through joint projects and by HLPDAB through a joint session on biotechnology policy and impact on regional trade.
4. PPSTI – both ATCWG and HLPDAB are focussing on new technologies. There are opportunities for joint workshops with PPSTI, examining innovation in agriculture, and spanning a range of technologies.

Neither ATCWG nor HLPDAB can afford to waste scarce resources by duplicating others' work. It is also essential that they are aware of and tap into the work of other fora particularly the OECD and FAO. This could be achieved by inviting representatives of such organisations to present at workshops as well as participate in projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

The following recommendations are grouped under key headings and are followed by comments that can guide implementation.

Terms of Reference

ATCWG Recommendation 1: ATCWG should continue and its Terms of Reference amended to include specific reference to consideration of women in the agricultural economy.

Comment – Neither HLPDAB nor ATCWG is considering the issue of women in their forum. This issue needs to be explicit in ATCWG’s terms of reference due to the focus of this group on small landholders. For HLPDAB the overriding issue is broad policy and the application specifically to women in the economy is considered less central.

This recommendation addresses the Independent Assessment’s term of reference regarding giving great consideration to women in the economy.

HLPDAB Recommendation 1: HLPDAB should continue its work until the current topics of low level presence and data transfer are resolved. However, if attendance in 2017 is below that required for a quorum it should be closed immediately and its work program transferred to PPFS.

Comment – a change of name to policy partnership was considered as a way to send a stronger signal about the level of delegation required, but it appears this may not be appropriate as HLPDAB is not intended as a public-private dialogue. At this stage it is unclear whether the low attendance relates to overlaps with the ATCWG timetable or if there is a more deep-seated lack of interest amongst economies (despite the clear relevance of topics such as those addressed at the workshop to regional trade). Economies commented that the real problem was due to the large number of delegates funded to come to the well-attended workshops being unable to stay for the main meeting because of APEC regulations which meant that if they stayed, they lost their funding. There is some opinion that this was a misunderstanding, and if so APEC would do well to clarify the requirements prior to the next meeting.

If HLPDAB is to cease, PPFS is considered the most appropriate “home” for the topics being addressed at HLPDAB, despite the lack of private sector engagement in HLPDAB at the moment, because of the closer alignment of its issues with the PPFS trade agenda, compared to ATCWG.

Strategic and Work Plans

ATCWG Recommendation 2: ATCWG’s Strategic Plan needs to be re-cast so that its individual goals are more clearly aligned with its Terms of Reference. Further, at each meeting a paper summarising measurable, objective progress towards its strategic goals should be included as a standing Agenda Item, with this paper being prepared by the ATCWG Secretariat or Lead Shepherd’s office as appropriate.

HLPDAB Recommendation 2: HLPDAB should review its Strategic Plan to ensure alignment with its Terms of Reference. The Strategic Plan needs to contain objective, measurable goals, progress toward which is reported at each meeting.

Comment – This recommendation addresses the Independent Assessment’s term of reference regarding strengthening of strategic priorities. While both ATCWG and HLPDAB have planning documents, both have gaps and would benefit from revision. Clear goals linked back to terms of reference, objective measures of progress and clear links between strategic plans and work plans would assist in maintaining continuity from meeting to meeting, given the annual gaps between meetings and (for HLPDAB) frequent changes in the Chair.

Project initiation and management

ATCWG Recommendation 3: Concept Notes need to focus on APEC priorities in order to increase their likelihood of success, expand their sources of funding to a larger number of APEC sub-funds, and seek co-sponsorship, where appropriate, with other fora including PPFS, PPSTI, SMWEG and PPWE.

HLPDAB Recommendation 3: The secretariat should work with Chair of HLPDAB to identify gaps in activities compared to APEC priorities and seek Concept Notes that will fill these gaps.

Comment – This recommendation addresses the Independent Assessment’s term of reference regarding better focussing and more efficiently and effectively managing tasks. Both groups need to be more proactive in initiating projects that meet APEC’s needs. Opportunities for collaboration between ATCWG and other fora have been identified by survey respondents. As HLPDAB’s focus is so specific it is less able to work closely with other fora but the HRWG would seem to be a likely relevant candidate based on the views of survey respondents. While details were not provided it can be surmised that economies believe this working group can support further capacity development needs in the sector.

Structure and Operations

ATCWG Recommendation 4: There should be no overlap between the scheduled meeting times of ATCWG and HLPDAB.

ATCWG Recommendation 5: ATCWG should maintain its current structure of one meeting per year, with any workshops relevant to the meeting agenda to be held before the meeting rather than after it, to allow issue raised at the workshop to be brought into the current year’s full meeting agenda.

ATCWG Recommendation 6: ATCWG’s agenda should allow for a joint session between HLPDAB and ATCWG to discuss any issues that are common to both groups. This session should go beyond a simple presentation by HLPDAB to ATCWG.

HLPDAB Recommendation 4: HLPDAB should continue to hold its workshops prior to the main annual meeting.

Comment – This set of recommendations addresses efficiency of operations. ATCWG and HLPDAB need to move to separate agendas with no overlap to allow both groups to run their meetings unimpeded. The two could be decoupled completely, with HLPDAB holding one meeting independent of ATCWG and then the two meeting sequentially during Food Security week but at non-overlapping times. If the HLPDAB meeting is held first, with its workshop preceding the main HLPDAB meeting, the joint sessions between ATCWG and HLPDAB could come early at the ATCWG meeting to streamline travel for the HLPDAB chair – or alternatively such a presentation could occur by teleconference.

Cooperation

HLPDAB Recommendation 5: HLPDAB should attend and present to to plenary sessions of PPFS.

ATCWG Recommendation 7: ATCWG should attend and present to plenary sessions of PPFS.

Comment – This set of recommendations addresses the Independent Assessment’s term of reference regarding collaboration with other APEC fora. Depending on scheduling, such presentations could be held via video link.

ATCWG Recommendation 8: ATCWG and PPFS should be reviewed at the same time in the next Working Group review cycle.

Comment – PPFS is new and has not yet been reviewed. Sufficient issues about potential overlap between PPFS and ATCWG (though at a policy and technical level respectively) have been raised through the review of the latter to warrant scheduling the first review of PPFS to be run at the same time as the next review of ATCWG – this may require bringing the next ATCWG review, forward. It is not considered necessary to also review HLPDAB at the same time.

HLPDAB Recommendation 6: HLPDAB should invite speakers from the FAO and/or OECD to its next meeting or workshop in order to learn from their current considerations of mutually relevant topics.

ATCWG Recommendation 9: ATCWG should continue its engagement with the private sector, and expand its consideration of technologies relevant to agriculture so it can address its broad objectives more effectively.

Comment: This set of recommendations addresses the Independent Assessment’s term of reference re greater collaboration with non-APEC fora. The work of the FAO and OECD on low level presence is particularly relevant to HLPDAB; whereas the aim with ATCWG is to expand its consideration of agricultural technologies by reference to organisations working in information technology, manufacturing, environmental protection and the like, in both plan and animal agriculture.

APPENDIX A – APEC WORKING GROUPS

Working Group	Relevance to APEC objectives	Working Group Objectives	Current Priorities
Agricultural Technology Cooperation	Contribution of agriculture to APEC economies	To enhance agriculture's contribution to the region's economic growth and social well-being	To improve capacity of agriculture and related industries and to share information in agriculture, biotechnology, and animal and biogenetic resource management.
Anti-Corruption and Transparency	Reduce the threat to good governance and economic growth in the Asia-Pacific	To coordinate the implementation of Santiago Commitment, APEC Course of Action and APEC Transparency Standards	To implement the UN Convention Against Corruption
Counter Terrorism	secure the region's people and its economic, trade, investment and financial systems from terrorist attack or abuse and trade-based money laundering	To coordinate commitments on fighting terrorism and enhancing human security; assist members to identify and assess counter-terrorism needs; coordinate capacity building and technical assistance programs	
Emergency Preparedness	enhancing human security and reducing the threat of disruptions to business and trade	To enable the region to better prepare for and respond to emergencies and disasters	To build capacity in relation to emergencies and disasters, and collaboration on emergency preparedness issues
Energy	Further APEC goals to facilitate energy-related-trade and investment	To maximize energy sector's contribution to APEC's economic and social well-being, while mitigating environmental effects of energy supply and use	To ensure energy security, removing barriers to energy trade and investment, facilitating LNG trade, promoting new and renewable energy, energy efficiency, and smart communities, keeping up safe nuclear power development, and cooperating on clean fossil fuel.
Health	Address multi-sectoral impacts of health threats	To address health-related threats to economies' trade and security, focusing mainly on emerging infectious diseases	To provide policy guidance, align activities with ECOTECH priorities, address life sciences and innovation
Human Resource Development	promote well-being of all people and achieve sustainable and inclusive economic growth	To build the region's human capacity and achieving this goal.	To develop initiatives on education, labour and capacity building to develop human resources
Illegal Logging and Associated Trade (Experts Group)	Enhance cooperation to address concerns with illegal logging and associated trade	To enable member economies to strengthen policy dialogue on combating illegal logging and associated trade and promoting trade in legally harvested forest products	To exchange information on policies, regulations, governance and law enforcement relating to combating illegal logging and promoting trade in legal forest products

Ocean and Fisheries	Facilitate trade and investment opportunities that promote the sustainable use of fisheries, aquaculture, and marine ecosystem resources.	To exchange information and help foster institutional capacity building; advance discussions and the development of solutions for common resource management problems and share best practices	Measures to establish a more integrated and sustainable ocean partnership in the region.
Science Technology and Innovation*	APEC's primary forum to engage government, private sector and academia in joint scientific research.	To enhance economic growth, trade and investment opportunities, as well as social progress, in harmony with sustainability	Strengthen collaboration and enhance innovative capacity; develop science, research and technology cooperation; build human capacity; support infrastructure for commercialization of ideas; develop innovation policy frameworks and foster an enabling environment for innovation.
Small and Medium Enterprises	Contribution of SMEs to APEC economies	To encourage the development of SMEs and to build their capacity to engage in international trade	To build management capability, financing and business environment
Telecommunications and Information	Building confidence and security in the use of ICT to promote economic growth and prosperity	To improve telecommunications and information infrastructure in the Asia-Pacific to become an information society	Telecommunications regulations liberalisation, development and implementation of advanced information and communications technologies, promoting security in these technologies
Tourism	Sustainable tourism as an economic driver	To share information and exchange of views and development of cooperation	Removal of impediments to tourism, increasing mobility, sustainable management of tourism, enhance understanding of tourism as a means of economic development
Transportation	Liberalisation of Transport Services; enhanced safety of transport systems	Efficient and safe transportation of Goods and People	Harmonisation of security measures, capacity building in security and safety compliance, liberalisation of air services
Women and the Economy*	Promote greater inclusion of women in the regional economy	To advance the economic integration of women in the APEC region	Focus on women's access to capital, access to markets, skills and capacity building, leadership and agency, innovation and technology

* Policy Partnerships

APPENDIX B – METHOD

The detailed steps of the Method are as follows:

1. Understanding of APEC's goals

Review of APEC key documents, APEC goals/objectives and procedures, other official and non-official assessments of APEC work including ECOTECH goals.

2. Review and Research HLPDAB/ATCWG objectives and activities

Review of key documents, primarily the agenda papers for both ATCWG and HLPDAB meeting in 2015, and statements by APEC.

Review of Leaders' and Ministers statements, records of meetings, key project documentation and activities to assess the outcomes and how the groups support the main objectives/goals of APEC, including mapping their activities onto APEC's current major objectives and measurement of outputs and outcomes through projects and other activities.

3. Survey

A short online survey of economy representatives was developed in consultation with the Program Director and also taking into account survey questions developed for the parallel reviews of two other APEC working groups in 2015. The questions were cleared with the Chair/Lead Shepherd of each group prior to dissemination in early August. Respondents were asked to complete the survey online by end August but due to low response rates the closing date was extended until the end of the ATCWG and HLPDAB meeting in September. Summary answers from the survey are contained in Appendix D – Interviews .

The Independent Assessor also interviewed representatives of economies at the HLPDAB Workshop in Peru on 19/20 September, the HLPDAB meeting on 20 September, and the ATCWG meeting on 21 and 22 September. Notes were taken during each interview and have been referred to in compiling the assessment.

4. Draft Assessment

A draft assessment was submitted at the end of September 2015 to the Program Director and Chair for comment on factual matters. A revised version of this assessment was then circulated to member economies for comment. These comments were also incorporated into the final assessment and significant comments were analysed.

Recommendations were provided with commentary regarding implementation and the specific issues that needed to be addressed by SCE rather than by ATCWG/HLPDAB themselves.

The draft final report was delivered to SCE at the end of October 2015

APPENDIX C – RESULTS OF WRITTEN SURVEY

A written survey was developed and, following input from both the Secretariat and the Chair’s Office, was administered using SurveyMonkey.com during August 2015. Five of the HLPDAB delegations and 6 of the ATCWG delegations provided responses during that period. The remaining delegations were invited to complete the survey during the APEC meetings in Piura, Peru during September August 2016.

The following pages summarise the responses to each question in the survey. Note that some respondents did not answer all questions and hence the total respondents in each question may be less than 11.

HLPDAB Survey

Question 1 – The HLPDAB was established in 2001 as an ongoing dialogue in recognition of biotechnology’s benefits to agriculture. HLPDAB was last evaluated in 2012. What do you think have been the three most important initiatives supported by HLPDAB during that time?

No.	Most important initiative	2nd most important initiative	3rd most important initiative
1	Food security		
2	Managing asynchronous and asymmetric approvals of biotech products for trade, including Low Level Presence (LLP) in food and feed (policy approaches/initiatives, challenges and considerations)	Russian Initiative of the HLPDAB - Development and Coordination of Systems of Information Sharing and Knowledge Exchange in the Area of Agricultural Technologies	Russian Initiative of the HLPDAB - Joint Development and Introduction of Innovative Agricultural Technologies and Biotechnologies, As Well As Improvement of Coordination Measures to Mitigate Impact of Climate Changes and Adaptation to Them
3	2015 Workshop: Fostering the Benefits of Innovation in Plant Breeding and Science Communication	2013 Workshop: Regulatory Issues on Emerging Agricultural Technologies	2014 Workshop: Plant Biotechnology Lifecycle
4	Promote transparent, science-based, and functioning regulatory systems to ensure safety and to facilitate investment in and the development and application of innovative biotechnologies	Exchange information and promote capacity building regarding the responsible use, development and informed adoption of agricultural biotechnology	Facilitate the management of regulatory differences by endeavouring to develop solutions to global challenges with respect to innovative agricultural technologies
5	Technology transfer to benefit small scale farmers	Publish and maintain APEC HLPDAB website	Harmonization of regulation especially LLP

Question 2 – HLPDAB’s terms of reference, approved in 2012, state that it should exchange information and promote capacity building regarding the responsible use, development and informed adoptions of agricultural biotechnology, as a tool to increase agricultural productivity, raise farm income, spur economic growth protect the environment, mitigate and adjust to the impacts of climate change, and to strengthen food security in the Asia-Pacific Region. Name the top three initiatives which you consider to have been important in meeting this objective.

No.	First initiative	Second initiative	Third initiative
1	strengthen food security	strengthen food security	strengthen food security
2	Exchange information and promote capacity building regarding the responsible use, development and informed adoption of agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase agricultural productivity, distribution of information on positive consequences and problems of use of biotechnology on specific examples of economies of APEC.	Distribution of information on positive consequences and problems of use of biotechnology on specific examples large-scale farms of economies of APEC.	Distribution of information on positive consequences and problems of use of biotechnology on specific examples small farms of economies of APEC.
3	2014 Workshop: Plant Biotechnology Lifecycle	2013 Workshop: Regulatory Issues on Emerging Agricultural Technologies	2015 Workshop: Fostering the Benefits of Innovation in Plant Breeding and Science Communication
4	Annual meeting	Technical workshops	work plans
5	Workshop on biotechnology and food security	Farmers' exchange	Training for scientists and the regulator

Question 3 – Second, HLPDAB’s Terms of Reference also state that HLPDAB should promote transparent, science-based and functioning regulatory systems to ensure safety and to facilitate investment in and development and application of innovative biotechnologies. Name the top three initiatives which you consider to have been important in meeting this objective.

No.	First initiative	Second initiative	Third initiative
1	Promote transparent		
2	To support working meetings on practice of assessment of biosafety of products of the modern agricultural biotechnology	Distribution of the file on biosafety for discussions with the public	Development and distribution of publications about achievements and risks assessments of the modern products of agricultural biotechnology
3	2013 Workshop: Regulatory Issues on Emerging Agricultural	2014 Workshop: Plant Biotechnology Lifecycle	Completed in 2016: Survey on the Regulations of Products Derived from Innovative Ag.

	Technologies		Technologies: Baseline Review of APEC Member Economies
4	Annual meeting	Technical workshops	work Plans
5	Workshop/annual meeting on LLP related aspects	Technology transfer functioning regulatory system	Publish on website for regulatory system

Question 4 – Third, the Terms of Reference also state that HLPDAB should build upon the work of international fora and existing international standards such as Codex Alimentarius Commission, to promote greater alignment of national standards with relevant international standards among APEC economies and public confidence in those systems. Name the top three initiatives which you consider to have been important in meeting this objective

No.	First initiative	Second initiative	Third initiative
1	None		
2	Harmonization from the WTO and WHO on problems of use of products of biotechnology	Harmonization on LLP	Harmonization of protection of intellectual property of products of biotechnology
3	2015 Workshop: Fostering the Benefits of Innovation in Plant Breeding and Science Communication	2013 Workshop: Regulatory Issues on Emerging Agricultural Technologies	2014 Workshop: Plant Biotechnology Lifecycle
4	Annual meeting	Technical workshops	Work plans
5	Outreach on Cartagena protocols	Workshop on GM detection methods with EU	Workshop on Codex in LLP

Question 5 – Finally, HLPDAB’s terms of reference state that it should support outreach and capacity building activities to help achieve the first three objectives. Name the top three initiatives which you consider to have been important in meeting this objective

No.	First initiative	Second initiative	Third initiative
1	None		
2	To enhancing an initiative development and coordination of systems of information sharing and knowledge exchange in the area of agricultural technologies	The organization of day of the biotech farmers at HLPDAB meetings distribution of information on positive consequences and problems of use of biotechnology on specific examples farms of economies of APEC	To enhancing an initiative of distribution of data on a profit of maintaining biotechnological agriculture

3	2015 Workshop: Fostering the Benefits of Innovation in Plant Breeding and Science Communication	2014 Workshop: Plant Biotechnology Lifecycle	2013 Workshop: Regulatory Issues on Emerging Agricultural Technologies
4	Annual meeting	Technical workshops	Work plans
5	Workshop on risk communication	Workshop on advanced technology	Farmers and scientists and regulators exchange views

Question 6 – HLPDAB’s 2013-2015 Work Plan groups the objectives listed above under regulatory harmonization and technical approaches to global challenges and lists a number of activities/deliverables. Please indicate how well you think these factors are being addressed by HLPDAB.

FACTOR	Average Score*
Sharing information on agricultural biotechnology	4.4
Promoting understanding of and participation in regulatory systems	4.4
Sharing information and experiences in establishing transparent and functioning regulatory systems	4.2
Active participation by member economies in PPSTI’s initiatives	3.8
Putting more emphasis on farmers’ welfare as a consideration in transferring innovative technology	3.8
Addressing issues of low level presence and working together to identify global solutions	3.4
Identifying applications of agricultural biotechnology	3.6
Promoting and developing mechanisms for collaboration and sharing of information and experience	3.4
Developing platforms for co-development and transfer of appropriate innovative technology	3.4
Strengthening the link between policy dialogue with other APEC fora for food security (ATCWG and the Policy Partnership on Science, Technology and Innovation)	3.8

**Note – this and other questions asked for responses on a Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”, with the midpoint neutral. These were converted to scores of between 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and are presented as averages for these and similar questions.*

All respondents answered this question. An average score of 4 equates to an “agree” and that of 3 is neutral.

Question 7 – Please suggest ways to improve action on any items above which you ranked “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”

One respondent suggested that economies needed to be more open to discussing solutions.

HLPDAB and Other APEC Fora

Question 8 –According to its 2013-2015 Work Plan, HLPDAB will strengthen its linkages with other APEC fora for food security. Please rate the relative importance of these for HLPDAB’s existing work (5 is highest)

APEC FORUM	Average rank	Reasons for ranking
Policy Partnership on Food Security	3.6	HLPDAB is closely related to PPFS as both have the same goal; Harness scientific innovations that address common challenges for smallholder farmers
Agricultural Technical Working Group	3.8	Need coordination between HLPDAB and ATCWG; agricultural biotechnology is important in modern agriculture; HLPDAB’s objectives are in line with ATCWG; Harness scientific innovations that address common challenges for smallholder farmers

Question 9 and 10 and 11 – Please rank the relative importance of the following APEC fora, with which HLPDAB currently DOES NOT have any working relationship, to the future work of HLPDAB (1 is highest)

APEC FORUM	Average rank	Potential initiatives suggested*	No. marked N/A
Counter Terrorism Working Group (CTWG)	16		4
Expert Group On Illegal Logging and Associated Trade (EGILAT)	3		2
Telecommunications and Information Working Group TIWG)	5		4
Tourism Working Group (TWG)	13		4
Human Resources Development Working Group	3.5	Invite representatives of the HRDWG to the next meeting of HLPDAB	3
APEC Business Advisory Council (ABAC)	1		3
Anti-Corruption and Transparency Experts Working Group (ACTWG)	10		4
Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy	9		4
Transportation Working Group (TWG)	8		4
Energy Working Group (EWG)	11		4
Small and Medium Enterprise Working Group (SMEWG)	8		3
Ocean and Fisheries Working Group (OFWG)	3.5		3

Emergency Preparedness Working Group (EPWG)	12		4
APEC Sub-committee on Standards and Conformance (ASSC)	2		4
Health Working Group (HWG)	8		3
Policy Partnership on Science, Technology and Innovation (PPSTI)	3		2

Note – only one respondent ranked all working groups *Taken from answers to Question 10

HLPDAB and External Organisations

Question 12 – APEC is encouraged to engage in greater collaboration with non-APEC parties including the private sector, civil society and other international organizations. In relation to the HLPDAB, please indicate whether you agree or disagree whether any of the following initiatives will achieve this.

Answer Options	Average Score
Non-APEC parties' participation in HLPDAB workshops	4.4
Non-APEC parties leading HLPDAB workshops	2.8
Roundtable events involving non-APEC parties	4
Non-APEC parties' involvement in development of the annual work plan	2.6
Connections with non-APEC associations	4
Non-APEC parties' participation in economy delegations	3
Specific engagement with women in business/ industry organisations, women's chambers of commerce and industry etc	3.8
Other	

*Likert scale question

An average score of 4 equates to an “agree” and that of 3 is neutral.

Question 13 - Please provide details of one initiative by organisations other than HLPDAB which has been, in your opinion, successful in strengthening ties between an APEC forum and non-APEC parties

- Exchange information and promote capacity building regarding the responsible use, development and informed adoption of agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase agricultural productivity, distribution of information on positive consequences and problems of use of biotechnology on specific examples (with Food and Agriculture Organisation)
 - US-ATAARI Funding Non-APEC ASEAN Attendance to the APEC HLPDAB Workshops, run by US State Department and funded by the US government, to influence these ASEAN members. Outcome was greater acceptance of biotechnology and it was successful because of high Quality Workshops and high quality participants. At least 50% women's involvement

ECOTECH Priorities

Question 14 – In 2010 APEC senior official endorsed a new Framework to Guide APEC-funded capacity building and all ECOTECH activities. Please identify what recent initiatives of HLPDAB have supported the following medium term ECOTECH priorities

INITIATIVE	Initiative
Regional Economic Integration	Peru's Initiative; APEC HLPDAB Forum supports collaboration and sharing of information.
Addressing the social dimensions of globalisation	Most economies are looking at the socioeconomic impact of the technology and taking it into consideration.
Safeguarding the quality of life through sustainable growth	Food security a main goal of the technology
Structural reform	
Human security	Food security

Note – two respondents

Question 15 - Please comment on any areas where you feel that HLPDAB could do more to support APEC's ECOTECH priorities as listed above.

Question 16 – Rank the following barriers to meeting APEC’s ECOTECH objectives since 2013, from HLPDAB’s perspective (1 is most significant).

BARRIER	Average rank
Lack of APEC funding for HLPDAB projects	1
Lack of support from ABAC	4
Lack of engagement initiated by HLPDAB with other APEC fora	3
Lack of engagement initiated by other APEC fora with HLPDAB	4
Lack of self-funding of HLPDAB projects from individual economies	2
Unwillingness of other APEC fora to engage with HLPDAB	8
Lack of non-APEC party (e.g. private sector, civil society) involvement with HLPDAB's work plan	6
Unequal engagement of women members of the community	7

Only two respondents only completed the question with many ranking N/A.

Question 17 - Are there any other barriers to HLPDAB’s ability to meet APEC's ECOTECH objectives (apart from those listed above)?

- Not very well communicated

Question 18 – APEC’s Tasking Statement for 2015 and 2016 set the foci listed below for HLPDAB. How well do you think that HLPDAB is addressing these?

FOCUS	Average score*
Commit to strengthening APEC agricultural science and technology innovation and cooperation with a view to facilitating trade-related agricultural products and promoting sustainable agricultural development; encourage the use of agricultural science	4

**Likert scale question, 3 is neutral, higher is better*

All respondents answered this question. A score of 4 is equivalent to “well” and a score of 3 is neutral.

Question 19 – If you have ranked HLPDAB's performance above as "Poorly" or "Extremely poorly" please suggest how it could be improved.

Question 20 – The APEC medium-term priorities listed below have been recommended for adoption in 2015-19. Please list ways that, in your view, HLPDAB could support these priorities

Priorities	Suggestions
Developing human capital through capacity building	Sharing the technology with farmers. Workshops
Developing and strengthening the dynamism of SMEs	See above Sharing information, forums
Harnessing technologies for the future and supporting innovation	This is what our goal in the forum is. Projects
Regional economic integration	Provide samples of collaboration, data transportability/ Workshops and Meetings
Structural reform	Meetings
Safeguarding the quality of life through sustainable growth	Goal of the technology is to increase food production with less resources. Sharing information, forums

HLPDAB’s Efficiency

Question 21 – HLPDAB is served by the HLPDAB Chair’s Office and the APEC Secretariat based in Singapore. These are responsible for managing meetings and ensuring that the work plan and actions are implemented smoothly. These questions relate to the efficiency of the secretariat in meeting these objectives. Please indicate your level of agreement against each statement below

Efficiency Measure	Average score*
Meeting agenda documents are made available within a short time of their receipt by the secretariat	4
After each meeting, summaries and other meeting outcome documents are made available promptly on the APEC meeting document site	4
Meetings are managed smoothly	4
Meetings run to time	4.2
The number of documents provided for meeting is manageable	4.2
The structure of the meeting agenda is well matched to the aims and objectives of the HLPDAB	4.2
There is sufficient funding available for the HLPDAB's projects	3
Meetings are scheduled to allow direct liaison between APEC fora where there is a common linkage	3.8
The current administrative arrangements for the working group meet your economy's needs	4
One annual meeting is sufficient for the HLPDAB's work program	4.4

*Likert scale question, 3 is neutral, higher is better

All respondents answered this question. A score of 4 is "agree" and a score of 3 is neutral.

Question 22 and 23 – Please suggest ways to improve action on any items above which you ranked Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

Nil response

Question 23 - What would make the HLPDAB secretariat more efficient than it is today?

The only comment here from HLPDAB respondents related to the timing of Food Security Week, which apparently reduced the amount of time available for consideration of draft papers. There was also a call for more funding support for developing countries.

Question 24 – What would improve the process of developing the annual work plan for HLPDAB?

More interactive meetings.

Question 25 – Is there an HLPDAB-specific process to enable quantitative or qualitative measurement of approved projects/programs?

1 yes

4 don't know

Question 26 – IF you answered yes to Q26, are the results of this research used to modify projects/programs to achieve maximum results?

Nil responses

ATCWG Survey

Question 1 – The ATCWG was established in 2000 as a forum for APEC member economies to enhance the capacity of agriculture (and its related industries) to contribute to economic growth, food security and social wellbeing. ATCWG was last evaluated in 2012. What do you think have been the three most important initiatives supported by ATCWG during that time?

No.	Most important initiative	2nd most important initiative	3rd most important initiative
1	No idea		
2	Strengthening Public-Private Partnership to Reduce Food Losses in the Supply Chain	Scientific Workshop on Measurement and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases in Livestock Systems for Green Production and Environment of APEC Members	Conference on Enhancing Global Value Chains in Agriculture and Food Sector in Asia-Pacific
3	Technological cooperation	Public awareness on technological communication	ensure food security
4	Food security		
5	Increasing agricultural production and productivity	Facilitating trade	Investment and food markets development
6	Stimulating Rural Development	Promoting Integration of SMEs into Agribusiness Global Value Chains	Workshop on Food Safety Systems

Question 2 – ATCWG's Terms of Reference, approved in 2010, include the aim of promoting activities to strengthen regional cooperation in food security and the production, processing, marketing, distribution and consumption of agricultural products. Name the top three initiatives since 2012 which you consider to have been important in meeting this objective.

No.	First initiative	Second initiative	Third initiative
1	No idea		
2	Strengthening Public-Private Partnership to Reduce Food Losses in the Supply Chain	Conference on Enhancing Global Value Chains in Agriculture and Food Sector in Asia-Pacific	High Level Public-Private Forum on Cold Chain to Strengthen Agriculture and Food's Global Value Chain
3	Workshop on Application of Remote Sensing and GIS Technology in APEC region	Training Course on Remote Sensing and GIS Technology	
4	food security		
5	Boost agricultural productivity and food production	Improving management of food supply chain	access to food for vulnerable people

6	Strengthening Public-Private Partnership to Reduce Food Losses in the Supply Chain	Developing a Manual of Good Practices to Improve the Supply Chain of Marine Products Aiming to Maintain Health of the Fish Stock, Strengthening Food Security and Enhancing Trade in the Asia-Pacific Region	Policy Forum: Towards an APEC Partnership on Climate Change and Food Security
---	--	--	---

Question 3 – ATCWG’s Terms of Reference also include the aim of conservation and utilisation of plant and animal genetic resources and development and extension of agricultural biotechnology. Name the top three initiatives since 2012 which you consider to have been important in meeting this objective

No.	First initiative	Second initiative	Third initiative
1	No idea		
2	<i>Skipped question</i>		
3	Workshop on Sustainable Development in the Agriculture and Fisheries Sectors		
4	sharing the information of new technology		
5	Facilitating adoption, utilization, extension and transfer of agricultural technologies	Promoting sound development of agricultural biotechnology	Accelerating transformation and upgrading of the agricultural industry and promoting sustainable agricultural development
6	Workshop on Plant Biotechnology Life Cycle	Workshop on Fostering the Benefits of Innovation in Plant Breeding and Science Communication	Workshop on Fostering the Benefits of Innovation in Plant Breeding and Science Communication

Question 4 – ATCWG's Terms of Reference also include the aim of sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS), integrated pest management (IPM), biosecurity, biodiversity, and control of invasive alien species (IAS) as well as promoting sustainable agriculture and related environmental issues, including climate change adaptation and mitigation. Name the top three initiatives since 2012 which you consider to have been important in meeting this objective.

No.	First initiative	Second initiative	Third initiative
1	No idea		
2	Scientific Workshop on Measurement and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases in Livestock	Workshop on Adaptation with Mitigation Initiative	

	Systems for Green Production and Environment of APEC Members	in Agriculture	
3	APEC Workshop on Food Security: Innovative Approaches for the Implementation of APEC Food Security Action Plan		
4	SPS		
5	Enabling agriculture to be more adaptive to climate change and resilient to disasters	Enhancing the management of food safety and of food quality	Strengthening prevention and control of trans-boundary plant diseases
6	Development of a Guideline for the Harmonisation of Pesticide Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) for Imported Foods within APEC Economies	Conference on Management and Related Scientific Detection of Food Additives in Foods	Workshop on Facilitating Trade through Updates on Food Safety Regulatory Standards of APEC Economies

Question 5 – ATCWG's Terms of Reference also include the aim of cooperation in the development of agricultural financial systems, investments and trade facilitation. Name the top three initiatives which you consider to have been important in meeting this objective.

No.	First initiative	Second initiative	Third initiative
1	No idea		
2	Seminar for Sharing and Discussing the Interim Outcome of the PRAI (Principle for Responsible Agricultural Investment) Pilot Project		
3	Facilitation of Sustainable Agriculture to Food Security		
4	investment on agriculture		
5	facilitating to improve agricultural trade	Strengthening internal exchange and cooperation among APEC economies	Liberalizing agriculture investment
6	Supply Chain Capacity Building for SMEs - Supply Chain Management, Cold Chain Storage and Technical Regulations	APEC Survey on Packaging and Labelling Requirements for Pre-Packaged Food Products	Workshop on Facilitating SME Trade through Better Understanding of Non-Tariff Measures in the Asia-Pacific Region for Agriculture and Food Processing Sector

Question 6 – The rows below list the factors which ATCWG's strategic plan deems to be critical for success of its mission. Please indicate how well you think these factors have been addressed.

FACTOR	Average Score*
Facilitating dialogue and creating opportunities to exchange views, share knowledge, information and experience among APEC member economies	4.3
Enhancing capacity building in food security and sustainable agriculture through workshops and projects in terms of knowledge, skills, attitudes, and uptake of innovation outputs. Improving linkages, networking capability and knowledge sharing	4.5
Promoting collaboration with other working groups of APEC as well as other regional and international organizations to jointly address issues on food security and food safety	4.3
Facilitating trade in agro-products and promoting technology transfer to accelerate the development and prosperity of agriculture in the region	4.2
APEC Member Economies adopting new tools to increase agricultural production and distribution	3.8
Strong working relationships with other relevant APEC fora on food security issues, such as the PPFs, SMEWG, OFWG, EPWG, PPSTI, SCSC and HWG	4.2
Member Economy commitment to and participation in ATCWG activities and implementation of its recommendations	4.2
Adequate funding for ATCWG proposed activities	3.6

**Note – this and other questions asked for responses on a Likert scale from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”, with the midpoint neutral. These were converted to scores of between 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and are presented as averages for these and similar questions.*

All 6 respondents answered this question. An average score of 4 equates to an “agree” and that of 3 is neutral.

Question 7 – Please suggest ways to improve action on any items above which you ranked “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”

Suggestions:

- ❖ The real impacts on policy changes is not clear.
- ❖ APEC should provide more funding for agricultural and food security issue.
- ❖ Promote the discussions on key activities and projects.

ATCWG and Other APEC Fora

Question 8 – ATCWG aims, among other things, to avoid duplication with and add value to other APEC activities and activities undertaken by international agencies and regional fora. ATCWG's Strategic Plan specifies an intention to work closely with several other APEC working groups, which are listed below. Please rank the relative importance of these for ATCWG's existing work (5 is highest)

APEC FORUM	Average rank	Reasons for ranking
Policy Partnership on Food Security	4.7	Agriculture has the potential to be an engine for economic growth and food security PPFS focus on policy but ATCWG pay attention to technological communication Ensure food safety in the region in cooperation with key stakeholders Support to implement projects.
High Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology	3.5	Near to work functionality of ATCWG Support to implement projects.
APEC Sub-committee on Standards and Conformance	3.33	Food security and food safety are very close Support to implement projects
Ocean and Fisheries Working Group	3	Fishery is really independent Support to implement projects
Small and Medium Enterprises Working Group	3	Support to implement projects
Energy Working Group	2.7	They have specific funds
Emergency Preparedness Working Group	2.5	
Health Working Group	1.8	

Note – 5 respondents ranked all working groups

Questions 9, 10 and 11– Please rank the relative importance of the following APEC fora, with which ATCWG currently DOES NOT have any working relationship, to the future work of ATCWG (1 is highest, 5 lowest)

APEC FORUM	Average rank	Potential initiatives suggested*	No. N/A
APEC Business Advisory Council (ABAC)	1.4		1
Business Mobility Group	10		1
Counter Terrorism Working Group (CTWG)	14		4
Environmental Goods and Services	5.6		1
Expert Group On Illegal Logging	6.75	Action plan for global value	2

and Associated Trade (EGILAT)		chains and timber forested products	
Human Resources Development Working Group	7.8		1
Investment Experts Group	6		1
Life Sciences Innovation Fund	7.4		1
Mainstreaming Oceans-related Issues Steering Council	10		2
Market Access Group	4.2	Workshop in 2017-2019	1
Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy	4.75	In the next 5 years, workshop on improving women's roles in agricultural production	2
Telecommunications and Information Working Group (TIWG)	8.75		2
Tourism Working Group (TWG)	4.6		2
Transportation Working Group (TWG)	9.25		2

Note – 4 respondents ranked all working groups *Taken from answers to Question 10 and 11

Question 12 – APEC is encouraged to engage in greater collaboration with non-APEC parties including the private sector, civil society and other international organizations. In relation to the ATCWG, please indicate whether you agree or disagree whether any of the following initiatives will achieve this.

Answer Options	Average Score
Non-APEC parties' participation in ATCWG workshops	3.7
Non-APEC parties leading ATCWG workshops	2.8
Roundtable events involving non-APEC parties	3.2
Non-APEC parties' involvement in development of the annual work plan	2.7
Connections with non-APEC associations	3.5
Non-APEC parties participation in economy delegations	2.7
Specific engagement with women in business/ industry organisations, women's chambers of commerce and industry etc	3
Other	

*Likert scale question

All 6 respondents answered this question. An average score of 4 equates to an "agree" and that of 3 is neutral.

Question 13 - Please provide details of one initiative by organisations other than ATCWG which has been, in your opinion, successful in strengthening ties between an APEC forum and non-APEC parties

No suggestions

ECOTECH Priorities

Question 14 – In 2010 APEC senior official endorsed a new Framework to Guide APEC-funded capacity building and all ECOTECH activities. Please identify what initiatives of ATCWG have supported the following medium term ECOTECH priorities agreed since 2013

INITIATIVE	Initiative
Regional Economic Integration	No idea Conference on Enhancing Global Value Chains in Agriculture and Food Sector in Asia-Pacific Workshop on the Application of Remote Sensing and GIS technology in APEC region Workshop on Facilitating SME Trade through Better Understanding of Non-Tariff Measures in the Asia-Pacific Region for Agriculture and Food Processing Sector
Addressing the social dimensions of globalisation	No idea Promoting Integration of SMEs into Agribusiness Global Value Chains
Safeguarding the quality of life through sustainable growth	No idea APEC International Conference on Natural Resources and Infrastructure Management for Agriculture (Thailand self-funded project)
Structural reform	No idea
Human security	No idea

Note – fou respondents

Question 15 - Please comment on any areas where you feel that HLPDAB has failed to support APEC's ECOTECH priorities as listed above.

Structural reform

Question 16 – Rank the following barriers to meeting APEC’s ECOTECH objectives since 2013, from ATCWG’s perspective (1 is most significant)

BARRIER	Average rank
Lack of APEC funding for ATCWG projects	1
Lack of support from ABAC	4.3
Lack of engagement initiated by ATCWG with other APEC fora	3.3
Lack of engagement initiated by other APEC fora with HLPDAB	4.3
Lack of self-funding of ATCWG projects from individual economies	3
Unwillingness of other APEC fora to engage with ATCWG	7

Lack of non-APEC party (e.g. private sector, civil society) involvement with HLPDAB's workplan	4.3
Unequal engagement of women members of the community	8

Note – original question asked for 1 highest – this has been converted to align with the presentation of data in other tables in this Appendix, for ease of comparison. Many respondents only partially completed the question with max respondents = 6.

Question 17 - Are there any other barriers to ATCWG’s ability to meet APEC's ECOTECH objectives since 2013 (apart from those listed above)?

Question 18 – APEC’s Tasking Statement for 2015 set the foci listed below for ATCWG. How well do you think that ATCWG is addressing these?

FOCUS	Average score*
Enhance capacity building in food security and sustainable agriculture	4.5
Progress work to enhance food security through the development of food value chains, and continue joint efforts by member economies to reduce food loss	4.3
Build and strengthen an open, inclusive, mutually beneficial and all-win partnership for the long term food security of the Asia- Pacific region	3.8
Continue efforts of the Food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF) and its Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN) in developing robust food safety systems in APEC member economies	3.6
Commit to strengthening APEC agricultural science and technology innovation and cooperation with a view to facilitating trade-related agricultural products and promoting sustainable agricultural development; encourage the use of agricultural science	4.3
Reiterate pledge against protectionism, recognising that bans and other restrictions on food exports may cause price volatility, especially for economies that rely on imports of staple products	3.6

*Likert scale question

All respondents answered this question. A score of 4 is equivalent to “well” and a score of 3 is neutral.

Question 19 – If you have ranked HLPDAB's performance above as "Poorly" or "Extremely poorly" please suggest how it could be improved.

No responses

Question 20 – The APEC medium-term priorities listed below have been recommended for adoption in 2015-19. Please list ways that, in your view, ATCWG could support these priorities

Priorities	Suggestions
Developing human capital through capacity building	Only officials (no farmers) Holding platform to share and exchange view Promoting multi-member projects.

Developing and strengthening the dynamism of SMEs	Yes, most of APEC farms are SME's Promoting multi-member projects.
Harnessing technologies for the future and supporting innovation	Yes Promoting multi-member projects.
Regional economic integration	Yes Promoting multi-member projects.
Structural reform	No Promoting multi-member projects.
Safeguarding the quality of life through sustainable growth	Yes Promoting multi-member projects.

ATCWG's Efficiency

Question 21 – ATCWG is served by the ATCWG Lead Shepherd's Office and the APEC Secretariat based in Singapore. These are responsible for managing meetings and ensuring that the work plan and actions are implemented smoothly. These questions relate to the efficiency of the secretariat in meeting these objectives. Please indicate your level of agreement against each statement below

Efficiency Measure	Average score*
Meeting agenda documents are made available within a short time of their receipt by the secretariat	3.8
After each meeting, summaries and other meeting outcome documents are made available promptly on the APEC meeting document site	4.3
Meetings are managed smoothly	4.5
The number of documents provided for meeting is manageable	4
Meetings run to time	4.3
The structure of the meeting agenda is well matched the aims and objectives of the ATCWG	4.2
There is sufficient funding available for the ATCWG's projects	3.2
Meetings are structured in a way that accommodates participation by women (such as arranged during periods where childcare is available)	3.5
Meetings are scheduled to allow direct liaison between APEC fora where there is a common linkage	4
The current administrative arrangements for the Working Group meet your economy's needs	4
One annual meeting is sufficient for ATCWG 's work program	4.3

*Likert scale question

All respondents answered this question. A score of 4 is “agree” and a score of 3 is neutral.

Question 22 – Please suggest ways to improve action on any items above which you ranked Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

- The fact that it is difficult to get APEC financing through ATCWG, most economies do use PPFS fora to get rank 1 and more chance to gain the APEC financing. This generates some duplications of themes between the two groups.
- provide sub-fund for agriculture and food security
- Promote more funds

Question 23 - What would make the HLPDAB secretariat more efficient than it is today?

Sharing summaries of projects and activities.

Question 24 – What would improve the developing the annual work plan for HLPDAB?

Active inter-sessional discussions.

Question 25 – Is there an ATCWG-specific process to enable quantitative or qualitative measurement of approved projects/programs?

3 don't know

1 yes

2 no

Question 26 – IF you answered yes to Q26, are the results of this research used to modify projects/programs to achieve maximum results?

1 yes – (we) will propose initiative in ATCWG and fund 4 projects in 2017-2019

APPENDIX D – INTERVIEWS

Discussions at the HLPDAB and ATCWG meetings in Piura, Peru in September 2016 focussed on the following issues:

1. Gaps in work programs of both groups, in relation to stated objectives
2. Overlaps (if any) between HLPDAB, ATCWG and PPFS
3. Enhancing response to gender issues in APEC
4. Potential additional activities if resources were increased
5. Involvement of the private sector in APEC work
6. The mechanism through which the outputs of the HJLPDAB workshop are considered at the main HLPDAB meeting and the process through which such outputs turn into outcomes for APEC

The following people were interviewed for the study:

- ❖ International Organisations: Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture
- ❖ Guests: representatives of private companies presenting at the workshops
- ❖ Members of the delegations of Australia; Canada; People’s Republic of China; Peru; the Philippines; Chinese Taipei; Thailand; and the United States
- ❖ Project Manager for HLPDAB and ATCWG

APPENDIX E – SOURCE DOCUMENTS

The following documents were reviewed

2015 Leaders' Declaration: The 23rd APEC Economic Leaders' Declaration – Building Inclusive Economies, Building a Better World

APEC (2014) – *Bogor Goals Progress Report*, October 2014 APEC#214-SE-01.19

APEC (2014): *22nd APEC Economic Leaders' Declaration – Beijing Agenda for an Integrated, Innovative and Interconnected Asia-Pacific*, http://apec.org/Meeting-Papers/Leaders-Declarations/2014/2014_aelm.aspx

APEC ATCWG meeting papers for 2015 and 2016

APEC ATCWG (2013): Proposed Work plan for 2014

APEC ATCWG (2013): Scientific Workshop on Measurement and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases in Livestock Systems for Green Production and Environment for APEC members, report of the ATCWG Workshop, Thailand, 2-4 December 2014, APEC Project ATC01, 2013A

APEC ATCWG (2014): Proposed Work plan for 2015

APEC ATCWG (2014): Strategic Plan 2015-2019

APEC ATCWG (2015): Attendance list at the meeting in Iloilo, September 2015

APEC (2010): Agricultural Technical Working Group Revised Terms of Reference, 2010 – APEC 2010/SOM3/SCE/025, considered at SOM Meeting Sendai, Japan, 24 September 2010

APEC (2012): Draft HLPDAB Terms of Reference 2012/SOM1/HLPDAB/SC/007, considered at Steering Committee Meeting, Moscow, Russia, 6 February 2012

APEC HLPDAB (2012): HLPDAB Terms of Reference, 2012/SOM2/HLPDAB/007, Considered at the SOM Meeting, Kazan, Russia, 26-27 May 2012

APEC (2013): HLPDAB Work Plan for 2013-2015, APEC 2013/SOM3/HLPDAB-ATCWG/007, considered at the SOM Meeting Medan, Indonesia, 28 June 2013

APEC HLPDAB (2015): Achievements from the APEC HLPDAB Meeting, September 30 - October 1, 2015, Iloilo City, Philippines

APEC HLPDAB (2016): Workshop papers 19 and 20 September 2016, meeting papers 2015 and 2016 and the set of documents provided for or tabled at the meeting on 20 September

APEC HLPDAB (2015): Attendance list at the meeting in Iloilo, September 2015

APEC Senior Officials (2011): *Policy Partnership on Food Security - Terms of Reference*, Policy Partnership on Food Security - Management Council Meeting, Moscow, Russia, 5 February 2012, 2011/SOM1/PPFS/MC/002

APEC Secretariat (2014): Guidebook on APEC Projects, Edition 9, February 2014

APEC Senior Officials (2014): *Toward Innovation-Driven Development*, presented at the Concluding Senior Officials' Meeting, Beijing, China, 5-6 November 2014. 2014/CSOM/010

APEC Senior Officials (2014): *APEC 2014 Senior Officials Tasking Statement (for 2015)*, Informal Senior Officials' Meeting, Manila, Philippines, 9 December 2014.

Ramage, C (2012): Independent Assessment of the Agricultural Technical Working Group and High Level Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology, APEC SOM Steering Committee on Economic and Technical Cooperation, August 2012

APPENDIX F – ATCWG PUBLICATIONS

Access date: 4 April 2016

2013:

Best Practices in Agricultural Statistics in APEC Member Economies – Baseline Study
Accessed 1625 times

Agricultural Statistics Best Practice Methodology Handbook
Accessed 1537 times

APEC Seminar Workshop on Mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation Initiative in Agriculture (AMIA)
Accessed 2344 times

Training Course on the Application of Remote Sensing and GIS in Crop Production, Summary Report
Accessed 1499 times

Summary Report – Interim Outcome of “Principle for Responsible Agricultural Investment” Pilot Projects
Accessed 1130 times

Training Course on BioGas Technology
Accessed 1185 times

Sustainable Land Management to Enhance Food Production of APEC Members
Accessed 2063 times

Enhanced Capacity Building for Food Safety Risk Assessment in Asia-Pacific Final Report
Accessed 5784 times

2014:

Nil

2015:

Scientific Workshop on Measurement and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases in Livestock Systems for Green Production and Environment of APEC members
Accessed 463 times

2016:

Final project Completion Report: High Level Private-Public Forum on Cold Chain to Strengthen Agriculture and Food’s Global Value Chain
Accessed 573 times