

## ANNEX 8

### INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT OF THE ECOTECH IMPLEMENTATION OF APEC WORKING GROUPS AND SOM TASKFORCES: AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION WORKING GROUP (ATCWG) AND HIGH LEVEL POLICY DIALOGUE ON AGRICULTURAL BIOTECHNOLOGY (HLPDAB)

Recommendations by Independent Assessor	Comments from member economies and/or APEC Secretariat	Suggested Action to be taken by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Proposed timeline to implement the recommendation by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Agreement on the suggested action (Yes/No)
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS TO SCE</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation to SCE1.</b> A merger of the ATCWG and HLPDAB is not supported. The ATCWG and HLPDAB operate consistently within their respective mandates and both have clear distinctive roles and expertise required for delivery of APEC goals.</p>		SCE to conclude discussions on the proposed merger at SCE1 2013.	SCE1 2013	Yes
<p><b>Recommendation to SCE2.</b> The HLPDAB has lost some of its impact through an expectation of high-level (Ministerial) involvement in annual meetings. The SCE should consider redefining the Dialogue, informed through the strategic planning process, and renaming the Dialogue accordingly (e.g. to the Policy Dialogue on Agricultural Biotechnology–PDAB).</p>		SCE to consider the name of the forum at SCE1 2013	SCE1 2013	Yes
<p><b>Recommendation to SCE3.</b> The SCE to endorse the BMC initiative on project evaluation and proactively seek the SWGE to commission several impact assessments of selected workshops/symposia to gauge the effectiveness and level of behavioural change attributed to APEC investment in ATCWG and HLPDAB projects. Importantly this should focus on the</p>	<p><b>APEC Secretariat</b> As project evaluation falls within the mandate of the BMC, the Secretariat can work with the SCE Chair to facilitate the process required to ensure BMC members are made aware of this recommendation.</p>	SCE Chair to inform the BMC about this recommendation.	SCE1 2013	Yes

Recommendations by Independent Assessor	Comments from member economies and/or APEC Secretariat	Suggested Action to be taken by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Proposed timeline to implement the recommendation by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Agreement on the suggested action (Yes/No)
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS TO SCE</b>				
level of change in capacity and capability across the APEC region.				
<p><b>Recommendation to SCE4.</b> The SCE should empower the APEC Secretariat in providing incentives to Economies for volunteering to the role of Lead Shepard. This might include, for example, providing an option of support to the Lead Shepard in terms of a facilitator for preparing and conducting annual meetings.</p>	<p><b>APEC Secretariat</b> The current APEC Secretariat mandate and resources offer limited scope for additional fora support as envisaged in the recommendation, however we would welcome suggestions for ways to improve the services we offer to all fora regardless of whether there is any difficulty in finding volunteers to take on leadership roles.</p>	<p>SCE to discuss as required.</p> <p>APEC Secretariat to note</p>	Ongoing	Yes

Recommendations by Independent Assessor	Comments from member economies and/or APEC Secretariat	Suggested Action to be taken by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Proposed timeline to implement the recommendation by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Agreement on the suggested action (Yes/No)
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS TO ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 1.</b> Each fora should, as a priority, develop detailed strategic plans that include clear SMART indicators of success towards delivery of their medium term goals. Strategic plans should be developed with input from complimentary fora.</p>		As per the recommendation	SCE2 2013	Yes

Recommendations by Independent Assessor	Comments from member economies and/or APEC Secretariat	Suggested Action to be taken by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Proposed timeline to implement the recommendation by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Agreement on the suggested action (Yes/No)
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS TO ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 2.</b> The Terms of Reference of each fora should be amended to include key selection criteria (or key attributes) for the nomination of future Lead Shepard roles. This should include specific abilities in adherence to the role of the fora as well as the ability to drive meetings efficiently.</p>		Proposals for amendments to the Terms of Reference for the fora should be discussed during a meeting of the groups.	SCE2 2013	Yes
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 3.</b> A membership education program should be developed for new members, and each meeting should reconfirm the roles, functions and expectations of members. A short manual developed by the APEC Secretariat could support this.</p>	<p><b>SCE Members</b> Canada: Canada agrees with efforts to increase the understanding of new members as sessions can involve high turnover, however, care needs to be taken to ensure membership education does not constrain what are already short agendas for the meetings.</p>	As per the recommendation	SCE2 2013	Yes
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 4.</b> Future meetings should continue to align with other major APEC meetings. Further, each fora should consider setting aside formal opportunities for intra and inter fora networking and engagement, including joint sessions dedicated to synergistic issues/opportunities.</p>		As per the recommendation	Ongoing	Yes

Recommendations by Independent Assessor	Comments from member economies and/or APEC Secretariat	Suggested Action to be taken by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Proposed timeline to implement the recommendation by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Agreement on the suggested action (Yes/No)
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS TO ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB</b>				
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 5.</b> Engagement strategies between technical and policy fora should be developed and incorporated into annual and medium term work plans. These should include formal cross cutting interactions through examination of opportunities for collaborative projects/programs.</p>		As per the recommendation	Ongoing	Yes
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 6.</b> The Dialogue should recognise that the majority of economies are signatories to and utilise the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Noting the challenges for implementing and adherence to the protocol, it should feature more prominently in the agricultural biotechnology policy dialogue work plans. Further, recognising the policy gaps between developing and developed economies across the APEC region, the Dialogue work plan should focus on narrowing these gaps as well addressing current and emerging issues relevant to all economies (e.g. Low Level Presence, synthetic biology, GM animals).</p>	<p><b>SCE Members</b> Canada: While Canada agrees that discussions on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (BSP) in year's when the Meetings of the Party are being held may be important (i.e. - every second year), Canada strongly disagrees with any recommendation that the BSP form the basis for discussions and agenda setting at the Dialogue. There is an important role for the Dialogue, as captured in its work plan and annual priorities, for discussions around the safe introduction of agricultural biotechnologies. A focus on the transboundary movement of LMO's would limit important discussions on regulatory frameworks and approvals and means to collaboratively address issues such as asynchronous approvals. Furthermore, two of the most active economies in the dialogue – Canada and the United States – are not signatories to the protocol.</p>	As per the recommendation	SCE2 2013	No
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 7.</b> The Dialogue work plan should consider setting an annual target of submitting 5</p>		As per the recommendation	ongoing	Yes

Recommendations by Independent Assessor	Comments from member economies and/or APEC Secretariat	Suggested Action to be taken by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Proposed timeline to implement the recommendation by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Agreement on the suggested action (Yes/No)
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS TO ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB</b>				
Concept Notes for APEC Funding (either as the lead and/or in partnership with other fora). An initial performance indicator of gaining 2 APEC funded or self-funded projects per annum should also be considered.				
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 8.</b></p> <p>Fora should develop joint policy papers on new and emerging technologies and policy challenges for APEC economies and strategies to achieve evidence based regulatory harmonisation for agricultural biotechnology based products. Outcomes and consensus positions should be developed and communicated to APEC SOM and Ministers.</p>		As per the recommendation	Ongoing	Yes
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 9.</b></p> <p>Fora should develop and deliver educational packages for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agricultural technologists in research promotion, communication and dissemination; and</li> <li>• policy practitioners in research assessment, management and utilization.</li> </ul>	<p><b>SCE Members</b></p> <p>Canada: Canada could support the development of educational packages, but would seek additional details on the nature of the educational packages and the objectives to be achieved and how these objectives align with delivering on the priorities of each committee.</p>	As per the recommendation	SCE2 2014	Yes
<p><b>Recommendation to ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB 10.</b></p> <p>Each fora should introduce an annual self-assessment 'health check' to</p>		As per the recommendation	Ongoing	Yes

Recommendations by Independent Assessor	Comments from member economies and/or APEC Secretariat	Suggested Action to be taken by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Proposed timeline to implement the recommendation by SCE or ATCWG & HLPDAB	Agreement on the suggested action (Yes/No)
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS TO ATCWG &amp; HLPDAB</b>				
ascertain performance over the previous years activities to guide continuous improvement.				