

APPENDIX B – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

General areas for improvements	Specific Concerns/ Areas as discussed in the Conference	Recommendations for Action	Desired Outcome
Good Regulatory Practices	Central body for the oversight of regulations (General)	<p>For APEC member economies with a central body for oversight regulations, assess whether best practices are used in the oversight of regulations.</p> <p>For APEC member economies without such central body or any alternative oversight body, consider instituting the appropriate legal framework creating such central body. Also, consider whether a centralized approach or a decentralized approach would be best suited to the economies’ context. This can be done through case studies or feasibility studies.</p> <p>For APEC member economies with several agencies sharing oversight functions, consider streamlining such bodies into a single body or propose measures to ensure accountability to an already existing central body that is higher up in the government hierarchy. This can be done through case studies or feasibility studies.</p> <p>Decide on what is the most effective strategy on addressing this issue: overall central body for all industries and sectors, or a central body per industry or sector.</p>	To ensure that government agencies, in all levels, are functioning at a high level with an impartial body tasked with the evaluation of good regulatory practices.
	Voluntary mechanism for regulatory reform	<p>For APEC member economies with such voluntary mechanism, continue good practice involved with regulatory reform. Also, evaluate the effectiveness of such voluntary mechanism.</p> <p>For APEC member economies without such voluntary mechanism, consider instituting the appropriate legal framework providing such mechanism.</p> <p>If such voluntary mechanism is not yet feasible at the national level, consider the implementation in select government offices, industries, or sectors. This can be done through pilot projects implemented during a fixed period of time.</p>	To institutionalize, at least incrementally, the awareness that regulatory reform is necessary for the improvement of government functions performed and services rendered to the public.
	Review of existing significant regulations (Session 2)	<p>For APEC member economies that conduct periodic review and prospective regulatory planning, determine what can be the most effective time period for such evaluation.</p> <p>Also, the inclusion of trade and competition principles should be considered in periodic review mechanisms.</p> <p>For APEC member economies without such voluntary mechanism, consider institutionalizing such review mechanism, at least for regulations that can be considered “outdated” in the agency, industry, or sector involved.</p> <p>Take steps to institutionalize review mechanisms for regulations. And formalize government-wide regulatory impact assessment activities.</p> <p>Review regulations not just on their intended economic benefit but for alignment with existing trade and competition principles.</p>	To instil the awareness that regulations should be commensurate with the demands of the present context, as well as to reap the benefit of more timely regulations for the agency, industry, or sector involved.
	Mandatory regulatory impact assessments	For APEC member economies with such mandatory RIAs for both existing and proposed legislation, consider more government-wide activities designed to institutionalize	To uphold the practice of mandatory risk impact assessments, with emphasis

APPENDIX B – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

	<p>(RIAs) (Session 2)</p>	<p>RIAs in all relevant agencies of government.</p> <p>For APEC member economies with mandatory RIAs for one but without such mandatory RIAs for the other, consider instituting the appropriate legal framework providing such mandatory RIAs for the other.</p> <p>Considering the nature of RIAs, mandatory RIAs for regulations to be crafted should be prioritized over those already existing regulations.</p> <p>For APEC member economies without such mandatory RIAs at all, consider instituting the appropriate legal framework providing such mandatory RIAs. If such mandatory RIAs are not yet feasible at the national level, consider the pilot implementation in select government offices, industries, or sectors.</p>	<p>prior to the crafting of regulations. On a secondary note, once RIAs are already institutionalized, to extend the conduct of these RIAs to already existing regulations.</p>
	<p>Public consultations to assess proposed and existing trade regulations (Session 3)</p>	<p>For APEC member economies with existing public consultation mechanisms, evaluate the reach of these mechanisms.</p> <p>Even if such mechanisms are existent, but do not reach the intended demographic (stakeholders or businesses), or reaches a demographic that does not know how to use the information made available by such public consultation, evaluate the dissemination technique used or educate demographic on best use for available information from public consultations.</p> <p>Explore technological advancements (such as information technology tools) in improving such public consultation mechanisms to address the concerns mentioned.</p> <p>Member economies should also ensure that all tools are employed in reaching and communicating with stakeholders (IT and traditional tools) to ensure that relevant stakeholders will not be left out.</p> <p>To evaluate whether the present timeframe for public consultation, particularly on the collection and receipt of comments or feedback from stakeholders, is meaningful enough to provide them with ample opportunity to give intelligent inputs for consideration.</p> <p>For APEC member economies without such public consultation mechanisms, consider instituting the appropriate legal framework providing such public consultation mechanisms.</p>	<p>For proposed trade regulations, to ensure that stakeholders are aware of the effect of such regulations and engage the regulators in devising mutually beneficial regulations. For already existing trade regulations, to point out the existing problems or the possibility of outdated regulations that should be modernized from a stakeholder perspective. To produce better rules and regulations.</p>
	<p>Single online location (Session 1, Session 3)</p>	<p>For APEC member economies with an existing single online location, evaluate whether the information contained in such online location is actually the information necessary to the stakeholders (such as regulators or business interests). If not, consider rethinking what kind of information would be necessary to regulators or business interests.</p> <p>The existence of such single online location should also be leveraged to include the public in the review process.</p> <p>A feedback mechanism institutionalized on the effectiveness of the capacity building program should also be provided.</p> <p>Content should also be geared towards the audience receiving such information. Also, capacity building-related content should be preceded by a structure on which</p>	<p>To ensure that not only is information accessible, but that the information made available in single online locations are actually useful information, or information that is preferred by the stakeholders involved.</p>

APPENDIX B – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

		<p>capacities can be built.</p> <p>It is important that a CENTRALIZED WEB PORTAL as one-stop shop be in place in order to ensure compliance with the objective of providing access to information, as well as LEGAL REGISTRIES.</p> <p>Continuous assessment and evaluation of the quality of the information uploaded in the online database;</p> <p>Improving the content from reportage of laws (de jure information) to useable information for stakeholders (de facto information)</p> <p>Improve access, ease of use and friendliness of the databases, and make the technology friendly and action on the feedback, timely.</p> <p>Use social media to test the quality and usefulness of the database.</p>	
	<p>Online public consultation (Session 1, Session 3)</p>	<p>For APEC member economies with online public consultation mechanisms, evaluate whether such comments or feedback given by stakeholders are actually considered by regulators, that is, whether these comments or feedback actually translate to better trade regulations. Otherwise, consider rethinking how these comments or feedback can be integrated into the drafting or amendment of trade regulations.</p> <p>Attention should be focused not only on the availability of information, but also the kind of access enabling stakeholders to participate.</p> <p>The system of online public consultation should be more “user-friendly” and “interactive.”</p> <p>Information made available should not be static; there should also be information on how to use such information. Also, the mechanism for feedback should be built with such system for consultation.</p> <p>For APEC member economies with online public consultation mechanisms, explore available social media tools to widen the reach of the public consultation mechanisms and explore innovations such as “mobile applications” to widen the reach of the public consultation mechanisms.</p> <p>For APEC member economies without a single online location or online public consultation mechanism, consider how modern technology can assist in instituting mechanisms at par with the modern age of trade regulations, where “outdated” techniques may lead to an inefficient manner of making information accessible or receiving comments or feedback from stakeholders.</p>	<p>To ensure that not only is information accessible, but that there is equal access to information for all stakeholders involved. Availability of information without institutionalized means on how stakeholders can use such information to engage the regulators.</p>
<p>Capacity Building</p>	<p>Implementation of capacity building activities for stakeholders (Session 3)</p>	<p>Since all APEC member-economies are compliant, no immediate course of action recommended except for evaluation of operational details and sustainability.</p> <p>In particular, consider establishing a “roadmap” for capacity building, with incremental milestones, particularly, the succeeding areas of concern: a) training on risk assessment and RIAs, b) evaluation of effectiveness of capacity building activities, c) education efforts on a domestic level on the importance of these capacity building activities (whether from government,</p>	<p>To ensure that the minimum requirement of capacity building activities, whether institutionalized or not, is recognized as a necessary activity for trade regulations.</p>

APPENDIX B – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

	<p>NGO, or other APEC member-economy initiative) and d) expansion beyond domestic boundaries through cooperation efforts with other APEC member economies.</p> <p>Adequate preparations should be done for capacity building initiatives to ensure that resources dedicated to it are maximised (decisions by the government so that the time and effort for building capacity are targeted at policies implementing the policies of government)</p> <p>Explore avenues of partnership with the private sector for development of training programs and innovative programs/systems.</p> <p>Twinning arrangements between economies (specific cooperation such as on technical assistance)</p>	
Training on risk assessment and RIAs (Session 2)	<p>For APEC member-economies with training on risk assessment activities and RIAs, evaluate whether these activities actually improve the engagement between regulators and the stakeholders, contribute to the creation of better trade regulations.</p> <p>Also, evaluate whether present training on risk assessment and RIAs is at par with “best practices” in the context of capacity building activities.</p>	<p>To ensure that capacity building activities are not only present on face value, but that training on risk assessment and RIAs are at par or substantially meets “best practices” standards for capacity building activities.</p>
Proposal of alternative capacity building activities (Session 3)	<p>Evaluate whether these alternative capacity building activities are actually at par with “best practices” in the context of capacity building activities.</p> <p>If not, evaluate how these alternative capacity building activities can be “gateway” mechanisms for the integration of training on risk assessment and RIAs into the capacity building framework, whether on the legislative level or on the executive level. This can be done through pilot programs for specific agencies.</p> <p>In absence of training on risk assessment and RIAs due to fiscal or logistical constraints, devise a roadmap within a realistic period of time to incrementally introduce such training on risk assessment and RIAs. This can be done through case studies and feasibility studies.</p>	<p>To ensure that capacity building activities are not only present on face value, but that such capacity building activities are at par or substantially meets “best practices” standards for capacity building activities.</p>
Evaluating the effectiveness of capacity building activities (Session 3)	<p>For APEC member-economies with evaluation mechanisms on effectiveness of capacity building activities, determine whether such evaluation is done via a) evaluation by a higher authority, b) evaluation by a separate independent authority, and c) self-evaluation.</p> <p>Determine whether the present evaluation mechanism is actually a meaningful evaluation scheme that contributes to raising the level of capacity building activities.</p> <p>If not, or if no evaluation mechanism on the effectivity of capacity building activities is present, determine what method of evaluation best suits the economic context of the member economy.</p> <p>Institutionalize feedback mechanism where stakeholders can comment on the effectiveness of the capacity building program</p>	<p>To ensure that not only are capacity building activities present, but that there is a conscious, systemic, and institutionalized effort to determine whether such evaluation scheme is constructive and not merely present on face-value.</p>
Existing cooperation efforts with other member-economies	<p>For those with existing cooperation efforts, determine whether such cooperation effort is constructive with respect to the member economy’s regulatory framework.</p> <p>For those without existing cooperation efforts, determine whether such absence of cooperation efforts is an obstacle to the improvement of the member economy’s</p>	<p>To provide a basis of comparison for effective GRP and capacity building practices, as well as evaluate whether the experiences of another member economy can be implemented in</p>

APPENDIX B – RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

<p>Education Efforts</p>	<p>Education of regulators and stakeholders on the importance of transparency in both GRP and capacity building undertakings.</p>	<p>regulatory framework.</p> <p>On the regulator level, to institutionalize education and training programs to prepare them for meaningful engagement with stakeholders, especially with respect to the manner of public consultation.</p> <p>Education efforts should be made towards a comprehensive review of regulations. Education efforts should also be made towards a framework that leads to regulatory coherence and being able to deal with growth integration in Asia Pacific for inclusive growth.</p> <p>It should be noted that the entire GRP program is a pro-SME (small and medium enterprises) program and a pro-gender program (women have a particular problem that needs to be addressed).</p> <p>Highlight the importance of transparency in the education efforts.</p> <p>Lastly, education efforts should be made towards the theme of inclusive growth.</p> <p>On the stakeholder level, strike a balance between the accessibility of information and the availability of public consultation mechanisms with the commensurate knowledge to use such information and to engage in public consultation in an intelligent manner.</p>	<p>another member-economy.</p> <p>To emphasize the importance of transparency in the engagement between regulators and stakeholders in the reduction of risks in doing business, and to encourage more participation from stakeholders.</p>
	<p>Technical assistance provided by donor international agencies or other member-economies for GRP</p>	<p>For those availing of such technical assistance, determine whether such assistance is constructive with respect to the member-economy's efforts to institutionalize GRP.</p> <p>Determine also which member-economy can best provide technical assistance that will help in the member-economy's efforts to institutionalize GRP.</p> <p>For those not availing of such technical assistance, determine whether the absence of such technical assistance is an obstacle to the member economy's efforts to institutionalize GRP.</p>	<p>To ensure that with the recognition that a member-economy's efforts towards GRP and capacity building activities may not be on the level of "best practices" at the present, avail of the opportunity for technical assistance in order to provide a basis of comparison for effective GRP and capacity building practices, but also to evaluate whether the experiences of another member-economy can be implemented in another member economy.</p>