

### Report on Synergies in ECOTECH Fora Work

The SCE Report on Improving ECOTECH in APEC (2013/SOM3/030) at point 7 tasked the Secretariat “to undertake a strategic assessment of synergies within the ECOTECH agenda after SOM1 and provide recommendations to SCE2 about gaps that may require SCE attention or direction”. This report is based upon a review of the intentions expressed by fora in their annual workplans that were made available at SCE-COW 2014. Four fora did not provide workplans at SCE-COW: the Policy Partnership on Women and the Economy; Mining Task Force; Ocean and Fisheries Working Group; and Telecommunications Working Group. Three of those fora (PPWE, MTF and TELWG) provided workplans just as this report was being finalised. The OFWG has an advanced draft workplan with active discussion continuing but has been unable to reach consensus.

The Secretariat’s review of plans has identified a great deal of planned collaboration between fora. However some gaps are also evident. Sometime cross-fora work is indicated in the plan of only one of the collaborators. On other occasions fora are planning to undertake work where collaboration should be investigated but has not been identified.

The table below contains proposed recommendations for SCE to make to fora. It points out areas where good collaboration should continue as well as areas where further cooperation could be explored. It is intended that, if endorsed, this table could be forwarded to fora under the cover of a letter from the SCE Chair.

Fora	Proposed recommendations on planned collaboration set out in annual workplans
ACTWG	<p>SCE notes that the ACTWG workplan does not identify any collaboration with other fora.</p> <p>SCE recommends that the ACTWG make contact with the EGILAT and SMEWG regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EGILAT workplan notes an intention to seek a joint meeting with ACTWG to explore areas of joint interest in combatting trade associated with illegal logging.</li> <li>• The SMEWG workplan notes an intention to collaborate with ACTWG on business ethics.</li> </ul>
ATCWG	<p>SCE commends the ATCWG on the good specific identification of cross-cutting work with the HLPDAB, PPFS and ABAC in their workplan.</p> <p>SCE notes that section 3D of the ATCWG workplan mentions that HWG, OFWG, EPWG, EWG, CTI and PPWE cover topics that touch on agriculture but contains no details about planned collaboration. The workplans of those fora do not appear to include specific plans for collaboration with ATCWG.</p>
CTWG	<p>SCE commends the CTWG for the good specific identification of cross-cutting collaboration plans, although identification of specific fora for collaboration on secure finance and secure infrastructure could be improved.</p>

Fora	Proposed recommendations on planned collaboration set out in annual workplans
EGILAT	<p>SCE notes the EGILAT's plans for collaboration and recommends that contact be made with ACTWG and SCCP regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Their intention to hold a joint meeting with ACTWG to strengthen law enforcement, build capacity and information sharing related to combatting illegal logging trade, as this activity is not mentioned in the ACTWG workplan.</li> <li>• Exploring with SCCP whether there is useful scope to discuss customs procedures and border control relating to forest products.</li> </ul>
EPWG	<p>SCE notes the many cross-fora areas of work identified in the workplan and suggests that EPWG provides a little more detail on each area of planned work in future plans.</p> <p>SCE supports the specific pieces of collaborative work set out in the workplan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with SMEWG on business continuity planning</li> <li>• Continuing cooperation with TPTWG on global supply chain resilience</li> <li>• A policy dialogue on Emergency Response Travel Facilitation with BMG and SCCP.</li> </ul>
EWG	<p>SCE recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EWG should consider reaching out to the MTF on plans for work to increase the share of natural gas in the energy mix and production, trade potential and environmental impacts of shale gas.</li> <li>• Make contact with the TPTWG whose workplan mentions follow up work from the 2011 APEC Transportation and Energy Ministers Conference that is not mentioned in the EWG workplan.</li> </ul>
HRDWG	<p>SCE recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HRDWG contact the SMEWG whose workplan mentions collaboration on integrating SMEs into global supply chains that is not mentioned in the HRDWG workplan.</li> <li>• The HRDWG work on cross-border education may require contact with GOS.</li> <li>• The HRDWG's planned work on financial education and literacy should take account of work on that topic undertaken in the FMP.</li> <li>• HRDWG's should consider approaching BMG to collaborate on planned work towards an academic mobility card.</li> </ul>
HWG	<p>SCE recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HWG continues close coordination with the LSIF, including considering the need for another joint HWG/LSIF High-Level Meeting</li> <li>• The HWG provides more specific details of planned collaboration in future workplans, the 2014 work plan emphasises cross fora coordination with LSIF, ATCWG, SCSC, EPWG, TELWG, ECSG and ABAC in section 3 but only provides specific details regarding the LSIF. Expected outcomes and deliverables do not indicate which, if any, fora will be collaborating on the work.</li> </ul>

Fora	Proposed recommendations on planned collaboration set out in annual workplans
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The HWG makes contact with the TPTWG whose workplan mentions collaboration with HWG on safety measures for motorcycle and scooter users, which is not mentioned in the HWG workplan.</li> <li>• The HWG makes contact with the SMEWG whose workplan mentions collaboration with HWG on business ethics in medical devices, construction and bio-pharmaceutical sectors, which is not mentioned in the HWG workplan.</li> </ul>
MTF	<p>SCE notes that the MTF provided its annual workplan late, around the time this report was prepared.</p> <p>SCE recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MTF develop specific plans for collaboration with other fora rather than general identification of possible collaboration partners</li> <li>• The MTF consider collaborating with the EWG on work regarding greater use of natural gas as an energy source.</li> </ul>
OFWG	<p>SCE notes that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The OFWG is actively working to prepare an annual workplan for 2014 but has not been able to reach consensus yet.</li> <li>• No other forum mentioned any planned collaboration with OFWG.</li> </ul>
PPSTI	<p>SCE notes the PPSTI's intention in their workplan to consider expanding coordination to EWG, HRDWG and ATCWG and encourages the development of specific proposals.</p>
PPWE	<p>SCE notes that the PPWE provided its annual workplan late, around the time this report was prepared.</p> <p>SCE notes the general intention stated in the PPWE workplan to consult and cooperate with other fora to improve focus on gender perspectives in APEC work but recommends that in future workplans the PPWE identifies at least a few specific areas of collaboration with other fora.</p> <p>SCE recommends that the PPWE take note of work planned by other fora that references the PPWE and collaborates as appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SMEWG – integrating SME into global supply chain</li> <li>• EPWG – women in times of disaster</li> </ul>
SMEWG	<p>SCE commends the SMEWG workplan for containing a good level of detail on planned collaborative activities.</p> <p>SCE recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SMEWG's work to improve SME access to finance should take into account the FMP's work in that area.</li> </ul>

Fora	Proposed recommendations on planned collaboration set out in annual workplans
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SMEWG make contact with the EPWG whose workplan mentions collaboration on promoting SME business continuity planning, which is not mentioned in the SMEWG workplan.</li> </ul>
TELWG	<p>SCE notes that the TELWG provided its annual workplan late, around the time this report was prepared.</p> <p>SCE notes that the TELWG workplan does not detail any planned collaboration with other fora.</p> <p>SCE recommends that the TELWG make contact with the CTWG whose workplan mentioned collaborating with TELWG on cyber security.</p>
TPTWG	<p>SCE commends the TPTWG for preparing a workplan containing detailed and specific plans for collaboration, including all activities other fora identified for collaborative work with TPTWG.</p> <p>SCE suggests that the collaboration section of the TPTWG workplan could serve as a model for other fora both for the clear way it is set out and the comprehensive coverage.</p>
TWG	<p>SCE recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The TWG should consider sharing the results of their planned work on taxation impacts on tourism competitiveness with the FMP</li> <li>• While the cross-cutting section of the workplan was good it could be improved with more specific details on planned activities under the TFI, including specifically identifying fora to cooperate with.</li> </ul>