



**Asia-Pacific
Economic Cooperation**

2010/SOM3/SCE/020

Agenda Item: 6.2

Report on the Independent Assessment of TWG

Purpose: Consideration

Submitted by: APEC Secretariat



**Third SOM Steering Committee on Economic
and Technical Cooperation Meeting
Sendai, Japan
24 September 2010**

Summary of Recommendations

The recommendations arising from this 2010 Independent Assessment of the Tourism Working Group reflect the considered and independent views of the assessor. Previous reviews of the TWG have been incorporated and built on. This assessment endorses all 15 of the recommendations made by Professor Dae-Kwan Kim in his 2007 report titled *An Assessment of the ECOTECH Implementation of the APEC Tourism Working Group (TWG)*. Also endorsed are the broad conclusions of Dr John D Bell's 2008 report titled *Finalisation of the Strategic Review of the APEC Tourism Working Group, Preliminary Report*.

In addition, we recommend to the SCE:

1. Persist with the TWG as a stand-alone working group in the short term:

- if the time ever comes when the TWG must be amalgamated, consider linking with transport or environment sectors.

2. Continue to challenge the TWG to reform, reinvigorate and re-focus:

- reform by developing at least one high profile, flagship project that will demonstrate the potential of the tourism sector to lead an APEC agenda;
- reinvigorate by asking host ^& } [{ a• to involve leaders of their private sectors in TWG meetings;
- re-focus by adopting a “program” approach, tracking and reporting progress towards tourism goals as well as APEC-wide agendas.

3. Encourage the TWG to experiment with its new medium-term work plan as a means to implement the “more strategic approach” called for in previous reviews:

- treat the plan as a tool for routine use rather than a reporting exercise
- adapt the prescribed template, articulating tourism goals and listing projects and action points under those goals.

4. Encourage the TWG to open its agenda to partner MOs for joint participation in projects or other action points where there is a mutual interest.

- weigh the supply and magnitude of co-funding as a factor in decisions about tourism projects.

5. In two years time, ask the TWG to review the Tourism Charter Goals.

- building on the experiments with its new medium term work plan.
- aligning the long-term Charter goals with the medium-term program goals.

We recommend to the TWG:

1. The Tourism Charter Goals remain relevant for defining APEC's tourism mission. As mission goals they should continue to be long-term and aspirational. After the

TWG has completed its current round of strategic planning, it should reflect on the Tourism Charter Goals and report suggested refinements, via the SCE, to the APEC Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Tourism.

2. There is sufficient continued interest in the TWG to warrant persisting with the TWG as a stand-alone working group, provided that the TWG should anticipate on-going pressure to reform, reinvigorate and re-focus. The TWG should develop at least one high profile, flagship project that will demonstrate the potential of the tourism sector to lead an APEC agenda.

3. If the time ever comes when the TWG must be amalgamated, the best prospect for finding areas of common interest at present is with the transport and environment sectors. However, any such amalgamation would dramatically change the nature of APEC's involvement in tourism.

4. A way to make TWG meetings vibrant and useful in future would be to encourage host ^& } [{ ^ to include the private sector when best practice examples are presented. Rather than merely inviting private sector interests for "show", it will be better to seek convergence of public and private interests in the host ^& } [{ ^ around an issue of relevance to the APEC agenda. The Singapore Cruise Forum was a model in this regard. The presence of the leaders of the host ^& } [{ ^'s national carrier airline, local cruise operators, international tour wholesalers, etc would enliven future TWG meetings.

5. In order to implement the "more strategic approach" called for in previous reviews, the TWG should switch from a "project" approach to a "program" approach. At present, various TWG projects are winding down and there are no new project proposals in the system to take their place. There is a hiatus. In a "program" approach, when one project finishes, new projects would be sought that continue the advance towards medium-term goals.

6. The reporting of tourism outcomes should be based on progress towards medium term tourism goals in addition to other, APEC-wide criteria. This will open the TWG's agenda to new funding sources and expose the tourism agenda to new ways to make progress, without relying entirely on APEC project funding.

7. A collective action plan for the TWG, as envisaged in Schedule 1 of the Tourism Charter, seems to be a vital missing element. Developing such a plan (a practical tool for strategic planning) would be a way to address Professor Kim's recommendations 1 and 9 and answer Dr Bell's recommendation for a "checklist" for assessing the relevance of TWG's projects. It would help in assessing and reporting outcomes. It would be the primary planning tool of a "programs" approach. In modern APEC terminology, calling the planning tool a "medium-term work plan" is more apt than "collective action plan".

8. A possible modified form of the Secretariat's template is suggested in Figure 2, page 22. In this form, the medium term work plan becomes an on-going, useful planning tool for the TWG and not merely a compliance exercise.

9. The TWG's 2010 Workplan could be recast using terms from the Manila Framework, basing the TWG's Medium Term Work Plan around 6 programs:

1. **Asserting tourism's place.** Medium term goal: "to assert tourism's place in regional economic integration"
2. **Human capital in tourism.** Medium term goal: "to promote human security through developing human capital in tourism"
3. **Socially and culturally responsible tourism.** Medium term goal: "to address the social dimension of globalisation through socially and culturally responsible tourism"
4. **Environmentally sound tourism.** Medium term goal: "to safeguard the quality of life through environmentally sound tourism"
5. **Policy alignment and reform.** Medium term goal: "To promote stability and efficiency through policy alignment and structural reform"
6. **Coordination with other fora.** Medium term goal: "To expand the scope of the TWG's influence through coordination with other APEC fora"

10. Fitting the new goals around a series of medium-term programs in the manner illustrated above is recommended in order to turn the TWG's Medium-Term Work Plan into a useful, on-going tool.

11. Alignment with APEC's immediate priorities should be accommodated at the Projects and Action Points level, rather than requiring major upheaval to the programs in the TWG's Medium Term Work Plan.

12. Tourism typically involves governance through some form of PPP, usually a tourism board of some kind. This private sector focus is reflected at global and regional levels in the make up of tourism's MOs such as WTTC and PATA. Tourism boards and MOs are likely to be better avenues for engaging tourism's private sector than the ABAC.

13. The TWG's Mid-Term Work Plan should be put before the TWG's "partner MOs" and an open invitation issued to PATA and WTTC in particular (and any others who prove their commitment by attending regularly) for joint participation in projects or other action points where there is a mutual interest.

14. Irrespective of where an initiative comes from, the potential for leadership by partner MOs should be explored. TWG's partner MOs have technical personnel with full-time responsibilities for multilateral engagement. For a Lead Shepherd to fit intersessional technical coordination of multilateral projects between his / her national priorities is extremely onerous.

15. As the TWG moves further into joint projects, opportunities for co-funding are likely to arise. Consideration should be given to weighing the supply and magnitude of co-funding as a factor in decisions about APEC projects.

Table of Contents

Summary of Recommendations	2
Abbreviations	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Background to this Assessment	6
3. Terms of Reference (TOR)	7
4. Methodology	8
5. Previous Reviews	8
6. Focus of this Assessment	11
7. APEC Tourism Charter	11
8. TWG Meetings	12
9. TWG Projects	14
10. Other TWG Activities	16
11. Action Plans	17
12. Strategic Priorities	23
13. Engaging with Other Agendas	26
14. Gender Issues	30

Abbreviations

ABAC - APEC Business Advisory Council
ADB - Asian Development Bank
APEC - Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN - Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CAPs - Collective Action Plans
ECOTECH - Economic and Technical Cooperation
ESCAP - Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
FAO - Food and Agricultural Organisation
GMS - Greater Mekong Subregion
IADB - Inter-American Development Bank
IMF - International Monetary Fund
MO – other multilateral organisations
NGO - Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PATA - Pacific Asia Travel Association
SASEC - South Asian Sub regional Economic Cooperation
SCE - SOM Steering Committee on ECOTECH
SME - Small to Medium Enterprise
SOM - Senior Official Meeting
TILF - Trade & Investment Liberalisation & Facilitation
TOR - Terms of Reference
TSA - Tourism Satellite Account
TWG - Tourism Working Group
UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNWTO - United Nations World Tourism Organisation
WB - World Bank
WGTP – Trade Promotion Working Group
WTTC - World Travel & Tourism Council

1. Introduction

This is the Final Report of the 2010 Independent Assessment of the APEC Tourism Working Group (TWG). The assessment has been commissioned by the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Secretariat. This report includes recommendations for action by the TWG and by the APEC Steering Committee on Economic and Technical Cooperation ECOTECH (SCE).

The analysis and recommendations in this report reflect the independent views of the assessor. The recommendations incorporate findings from previous TWG reviews. They also incorporate the feedback from TWG members and other Multilateral Organisations (MOs) received during the course of the assessment.

The assessment process has included:

- the assessor participated in the 36th TWG meeting in Lombok on 5 May 2010 and had informal, one-on-one consultations with member economies and MOs on the side-lines of that meeting
- a Preliminary Report and Questionnaire was circulated to TWG members and MOs on 14 July 2010
- a Draft Final report was circulated to TWG members and MOs on 28 August 2010

The remainder of the assessment process will involve:

- this Final Report will be presented and discussed at the 37th TWG meeting in Nara, Japan in September 2010
- a summary of the assessor's recommendations will be presented to the SCE3 at Sendai, Japan in September 2010

2. Background to this Assessment

The SOM Committee on ECOTECH (SCE) has a mandate to strengthen the prioritisation and effective implementation of ECOTECH activities by various APEC fora. When it was established in 2006, Ministers instructed SCE to ensure ECOTECH activities are targeted, effective and efficient to make the best use of scarce resources.

In 2007, Ministers received fora reviews and instructed further reviews and streamlining in recognition of the importance of an ongoing program of independent assessments. By November 2009, the Senior Officials Report on ECOTECH recorded that six independent assessments of working groups had been completed.

In 2010, the Budget and Management Committee approved a SCE project for an independent assessment of the TWG to address the wide range of needs of the TWG in order to strengthen its work process. An assessor was commissioned by the APEC Secretariat and instructed to meet with the TWG and incorporate the TWG's recent in-house reviews.

The assessor was Mr Les Clark of Tourism Resource Consultants, New Zealand. Mr Clark is a tourism planner with experience throughout Asia Pacific, including work with the TWGs of other regional groupings (GMS, Tumen River Area, SASEC). The consulting team at Tourism Resource Consultants undertook the analysis of feedback on the Preliminary Report and Draft Final Report, both of which were circulated by the APEC Secretariat. Mr Clark takes individual responsibility for all errors and omissions in this document. He extends personal thanks to the Lead Shepherd and all individuals from member economies, MOs and the APEC Secretariat who assisted.

3. Terms of Reference (TOR)

The APEC Secretariat's TOR call for the following consultancy services:

1. Review TWG meetings, projects and activities and assess their outcomes;
2. Evaluate how these activities are supporting the main objectives of the TWG and APEC;
3. Explore how TWG can better take into account the APEC commitment to give gender greater consideration;
4. Assess the impact of the TWG work program "on the ground" in APEC member economies;
5. Identify ways to develop synergies among the work of TWG and various relevant APEC fora;
6. Identify the TWG opportunities for greater collaboration with non-APEC parties, including the private sector, civil society and other international organisations.
7. Identify ways for the TWG to tap resources for programs; opportunities to profile and share programs or projects;
8. Identify ways to strengthen the TWG strategic priorities and direction for future works.
9. Evaluate whether the TWG is operating effectively or whether its Terms of Reference should be changed to better respond to its priorities and APEC goals.
10. 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 the Leaders' and Ministers' priorities.
11. Include recommendations from relevant business, NGO and/or academic representatives, who attend meetings of the TWG, on how best to encourage

and leverage private sector partnerships and engage non-member multilateral organisations.

12. Finalise an array of recommendations on the above-mentioned areas. Recommendations are to be provided in two lists: the first list entailing the (no more than) 5 decision points for consideration by the SCE to provide further instruction to the group, and the second list covering those recommended actions that can be further discussed for implementation by TWG itself.
13. Provide a draft report on initial findings, of no more than 30 pages, written clearly and containing robust analysis to be conveyed to the Project Overseer and the APEC Secretariat; the SCE and TWG members.
14. Analyse member economies' responses to the draft report on initial findings;
15. Present the final report employing a clear and diplomatic style of presentation.

4. Methodology

The TOR provided for “a survey, if required, across APEC member economies”. Based on initial consultations held between TWG members and the consultant at the 36th TWG meeting in Lombok¹, some initial assertions were made by the consultant about the effectiveness of the TWG and the potential opportunities around it. A Preliminary Report containing these assertions was sent out to TWG members and MOs on 14 July 2010 as a means to attract comment and feedback.

The Preliminary Report incorporated a questionnaire. This approach was designed to encourage participation in the assessment, to tap the knowledge and wisdom of TWG members and to facilitate communication with the assessor. Feedback from twelve (12) member economies and one (1) MO was collated and analysed. The results of the analysis are attached to this Draft Final Report as Appendix 1.

When the Draft Final Report was circulated to member economies and MOs on 28 August 2010, comments were invited on any aspect of the assessment. A further and final opportunity for inputs by member economies and MOs will occur at the 37th TWG meeting in Japan in September 2010.

5. Previous Reviews

There have been two previous reviews of the TWG in the past four years. In the opinion of the assessor, and from the feedback from TWG members and MOs, the findings of the two previous reviews remain largely relevant. They contained accurate reflections of the TWG's viewpoints at that time. The assessor has carefully considered the recommendations of these previous reviews. The recommendations are recorded in this report. Many are also reflected in the recommendations of this assessment.

¹ 4-6th May 2010

An Assessment of the ECOTECH Implementation of the APEC Tourism Working Group (TWG), 2007

In August 2007, Professor Dae-Kwan Kim, College of Hotel and Tourism Management, Kyung Hee University, Seoul, Republic of Korea, presented a review of the TWG. The purpose of Professor Kim's review was to assess the TWG's performance and identify ways to improve its operation. He made findings in key areas: TWG functions; TWG operations; TWG projects; and collaboration.

Professor Kim's review included an assessment of general economic indicators associated with tourism in the APEC Region. He presented the results of a questionnaire survey that had canvassed the views of tourism officials and industry associations in member economies. Officials and associations had answered questions about their awareness of APEC's Tourism Charter goals, the relevance of those goals and the achievement of the goals. Other questions targeted awareness of the outputs of the TWG and the effectiveness of the TWG's operating framework.

In essence, Professor Kim found that the "goals, sub-goals, objectives and considerations of the APEC Tourism Charter are still relevant and well-determined". While its goals are largely understood, "there is a lack of awareness of sub-goals, objectives and considerations". He noted that sub-goals, objectives and considerations are necessary "to provide focus and strategic direction" and the TWG should "make better use of these elements as they provide a framework for its activities". Professor Kim also noted "there appears to be a lack of role for policy goal chairs, with greater emphasis placed on project overseers" and he called for more work in this area.

Examining Professor Kim's data for the purposes of the current assessment the assessor noted that the three lowest scores in "effectiveness of the TWG's operations" went to: "information dissemination"; "collective and individual economy action plans" and "executive management committee support". While effectiveness overall was considered high, the survey found that in these three areas the TWG was least effective.

Professor Kim made 15 recommendations:

1. The TWG should utilise the sub-goals, objectives and considerations of the APEC Tourism Charter to provide greater focus and drive to the APEC Tourism Charter goals.
2. The TWG should regularly review the role and need for policy goal chairs.
3. The TWG should amend the standard agenda for its meetings to include a number of sessions focusing on key issues impacting on tourism in the APEC region.
4. The TWG should decrease the time spent during meetings on reporting of progress on TWG projects, but include information on the implementation of projects.
5. The TWG should extend the term for Chair/Lead Shepherd to two years.

6. The TWG Chair/Lead Shepherd should provide greater leadership to TWG members during its term, and outside of the two meetings.
7. The Chair/Lead Shepherd should undertake ongoing monitoring of TWG activities to ensure it is progressing the priorities outlined in the TWG workplan.
8. The Chair/Lead Shepherd should place greater emphasis on building relationships with its counterparts in other APEC sub-fora.
9. The TWG should take a more strategic approach to project development to ensure projects meet both the broader APEC goals as well as Tourism Charter Goals and the priorities set out in the TWG workplan.
10. The TWG should focus projects on capacity building and ensure that projects have a detailed implementation plan, with real outcomes.
11. The TWG should utilise APEC's project evaluation framework for all APEC projects. In doing this, the TWG may wish to explore the option of establishing a project evaluation sub-committee.
12. The TWG should seek to access central APEC funding for its projects.
13. The TWG should increase its efforts in collaboration with the private sector, industry associations and other multilateral organisations.
14. The TWG should foster relationships with other relevant APEC sub-fora.
15. The TWG should maximise the opportunities offered by its guest members in both collaboration on issues of shared interest and to raise the profile of the TWG.

*Finalisation of the Strategic Review of the APEC Tourism Working Group
Preliminary Report, 2008*

In March 2008, a supplementary report was prepared for the TWG by Dr John D Bell, Director of Innovation Strategies Pty Ltd, Australia. The purpose of this report was to assess and assist implementation of Professor Kim's work. Dr Bell endorsed Professor Kim's findings and reported excellent progress in implementing his recommendations. Dr Bell also added some recommendations, including that the Executive Committee should scan other fora for synergies and that the Lead Shepherd should be proactive between sessions to prompt members into action.

Dr Bell commended the notion of paying greater attention to goals, sub-goals and objectives and suggested the use of a "checklist" for project proposals to give effect to this. He further recommended that current issues should be tabled at each meeting for follow-up at the next meeting, Policy Goal Chairs should be responsible for bringing new project proposals to the Executive Committee and TWG members should keep the TWG's Goals in mind when proposing new projects. His report

concluded that the TWG is most effective when its members are actively involved in projects.

6. Focus of this Assessment

The assessor's TOR conclude with the request:

“Recommend, as appropriate, best practices to assist the fora in improving the management and coordination of programs to effectively meet APEC's goals and objectives.”

Given that this independent assessment is being conducted for the SCE, this request must be seen in the context of the SCE's objectives, which are (as at February 2010):

1. To strengthen implementation of the APEC's ECOTECH activities by prioritising in accordance with Leaders' and Ministers' commitments, coordinating and providing oversight of the work of APEC fora.
2. To provide policy guidance on ways to contribute to APEC's ECOTECH goals.
3. To coordinate ECOTECH objectives and priorities set by APEC's Economic Leaders and Ministers.

The assessor came to an early conclusion that an important outcome of this assessment could be finding practical ways to improve the operations of the TWG. This would continue the impetus of the previous reviews and address the SCE's mandate. The questionnaire respondents generally endorsed this view. One member economy (Australia) felt the assessment should also revisit the TWG's goals. Others (Thailand and New Zealand) emphasised that the assessment should also ensure concrete outcomes from the TWG's work.

7. APEC Tourism Charter

The TWG's mandate stems from the Seoul Declaration on an APEC Tourism Charter, an outcome of the First APEC Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Tourism held in July 2000 at Seoul, Korea. The declaration established four goals for APEC's tourism mission. It also outlined the ways these mission goals would be addressed (summarised below).

Goal 1: Remove impediments to tourism business and investment

(To be addressed through: mobility of skills, training and labour; productive investment; regulatory impediments; and liberalisation of trade in services.)

Goal 2: Increase mobility of visitors and demand for tourism goods and services in the APEC region.

(To be addressed through: travel facilitation; visitor experiences; inter- and intra-regional cooperation in marketing; e-commerce for tourism; safety and security; and non-discriminatory approaches)

Goal 3: Sustainably manage tourism outcomes and impacts:

(To be addressed through: environmental appreciation; sustainable development, particularly for SMEs; social integrity and implications of gender; local and indigenous cultures and national cultural heritage; and capability building.)

Goal 4: Enhance recognition and understanding of tourism as a vehicle for economic and social development.

(To be addressed through harmonising statistics, information exchange, role of tourism in the economy, and collective knowledge based on tourism issues.)

The two previous reviews strongly endorsed the APEC Tourism Charter Goals as the foundations of the TWG's mandate.

With one exception, our respondents agreed that the Tourism Charter Goals remain relevant for defining APEC's tourism mission. Australia suggested that Goals 1 and 4 should be beefed up. As mission goals they should continue to be long-term and aspirational. After the TWG has completed its current round of strategic planning, it should reflect on the Tourism Charter Goals and report suggested refinements, via the SCE, to the APEC Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Tourism.

8. TWG Meetings

The assessor attended the 36th TWG Meeting on Lombok in May 2010. As well as providing an opportunity for briefings by the APEC Secretariat and by Lead Shepherds, past and present, it also provided an opportunity to engage with TWG members and MOs and to observe the conduct of the meeting.

The ultimate measure of satisfaction with the fora of a regional grouping is that the participants continue to attend meetings. The fact that the TWG has completed thirty-six meetings is itself a testimony to success. However, six of the 21 member economies chose not to come to the 36th meeting, a figure typical of the last five years.

Like all other APEC fora, the TWG is under constant review by the SCE. In 2006, SCE recommended that the Trade Promotion Working Group (WGTP) be incorporated into the Small and Medium Enterprises Working Group (SMEWG). Consideration was also given to including the TWG in this amalgamation. In the end the SCE recommended that the TWG should remain an independent working group, but be subject to further review in future. This came with a request that the TWG report back with concrete proposals on reforming, reinvigorating and re-focusing the TWG.

From conversations with participants at the 36th TWG meeting and from the evidence of the questionnaire responses, it is clear that motivations for participating in the TWG vary considerably. The success of TWG meetings is judged according to these varying motivations. The most consistently valued reasons for engaging with the TWG are “cooperation and collaboration” and “information sharing”. Also considered important are “networking with experienced people”, “international relations”, “lobbying on current issues” and “being exposed to best practice examples”. The dominance of these reasons highlights the importance of the TWG meetings themselves.

“A sense of political obligation” is important to some, and “the development and maintenance of bilateral relations” to others. Developing economies rank “projects are valuable” more highly than developed economies. One of the most concrete reported outcomes of TWG participation was around “advocacy” – specifically using an APEC voice to lobby European-dominated groups to reconsider their stand on the treatment of aviation emissions.

Reasons for not attending TWG meetings included “competing work commitments”, “limited resources” and concern that “unspecified meeting agendas make it difficult to decide if attending the meeting will be worthwhile”. Again, this highlights the critical importance of the actual meetings.

Although motivations vary, the member economies that attend TWG meetings feel they have good reasons for engaging. Their reasons are very sector-specific. The reluctance of the TWG to see tourism submerged within a SMEWG / WGTP amalgamation is very understandable. In the opinion of this assessor, there is sufficient continued interest in the TWG to warrant persisting with the TWG as a stand-alone working group, provided that pressure should remain on the TWG to reform, reinvigorate and re-focus. There was an excellent response at the 36th TWG meeting to the Lead Shepherd’s renewed call for rejuvenation.

A lesson from the successes of the tourist working groups of other regional groupings (eg GMS, ASEAN) is that tourism does lend itself to regional cooperation. Tourism people are usually highly motivated to understand the international context of the sector. Other groupings have used tourism successfully for purposes ranging from creating awareness of the region (typically by promoting multiple ^& } [{ Æ• as a single destination) through to facilitation of cross-border travel (recognising that what enables tourism also enables the business traveller). This potential value of tourism as a ‘flagship sector’ is a strong reason to persist with a stand-alone TWG. The TWG should develop at least one high profile, flagship project that will demonstrate the potential of the tourism sector to lead an APEC agenda. This will help ensure TWG’s survival as a stand-alone working group.

If the time ever comes when the TWG must be amalgamated, the best prospect for finding areas of common interest at present is with the transport and environment sectors. At present there is a strong rationale for working closely with both of these sectors around liberalising transport linkages within APEC and ensuring an APEC voice in the global dialogue on the carbon emissions of transport. However, in practice, the transport and environment sectors speak a different language. The current motivations for the tourism sectors of member economies to engage in APEC

would not be met by amalgamation. Amalgamation would dramatically change the nature of APEC's involvement in tourism.

Many respondents called for more involvement with the private sector. The assessor's personal reaction to the 36th TWG meeting included surprise at the absence of any private sector interests other than PATA and WTTC. In successful tourism destinations throughout the world it is normal to find a national tourism organisation based on some form of public / private partnership (PPP), often in the form of a tourism board. For this reason, and because tourism is most often private sector led, a tourism sector meeting without the private sector present seems unusual and unbalanced.

It may be easy to say and much harder to do, but a way to make TWG meetings vibrant and useful in future would be to encourage host ^& } [{ ð• to include the private sector when best practice examples are presented. Rather than merely inviting private sector interests for "show", it will be better to seek convergence of public and private interests in the host ^& } [{ ^ around an issue of relevance to the APEC agenda. The Singapore Cruise Forum was a model in this regard. The presence of the leaders of the host ^& } [{ ^'s national carrier airline, local cruise operators, international tour wholesalers, etc would enliven future TWG meetings.

Comments from questionnaire respondents illustrated the widespread enthusiasm for finding ways to rejuvenate TWG meetings along these lines:

"When the TWG is holding a TMM or a TWG meeting, it should pursue private sector sponsorship of events more robustly to give a special opportunity for businesses to promote themselves to the APEC economies." (US)

"There could readily be more of an open forum component of the TWG and TMM meetings with a more constructive engagement with the host economy's tourism industry." (NZ)

"An example would be to have the APEC transport working group and the Tourism Working group to host a joint meeting and then have IATA and ICAO participate on the wide range of interfaces between tourism and aviation." (NZ)

"Private sector involvement is highly recommended. Representatives from tourism association should have opportunity to observe the meeting of TWG and TMM as guest in separate session in order to seek advice from private sector." (Thailand)

9. TWG Projects

As of September 2009, APEC working groups and taskforces had registered 93 ECOTECH-related projects. These include 81 projects for APEC funding and 12 self-funded by member economies or groups of member economies.

Appendix 2 to this paper contains a list of TWG projects over the last decade. It is evident from previous reviews and from consultations at the 36th TWG meeting that the number of projects that have attracted APEC funding is generally considered an important measure of a working group's success. As an extension of this, the

significance of any initiative seems to be automatically measured against APEC's project funding criteria. This approach is in sharp contrast to the tourism working groups of other regional groupings (GMS, SASEC), where the highest accolades go to projects that succeed in attracting external funding.

At present, other than the number of projects undertaken, quantifying how successful the TWG is being towards achieving APEC goals is problematic. In attempting to assess the output of TWG projects, Professor Kim resorted to comparing the relative expenditure on TWG projects against those of other APEC fora, noting that the TWG's spending was relatively light. When it came to assessing the outputs of projects he could go no further than:

"The outputs of TWG projects are required to address issues relating to the four policy goals of the APEC Tourism Charter. These outputs generally fall within two broad categories:

1. Communication of knowledge: specific activities include workshops, training sessions, conferences, organising a forum, and establishing and operating a network.
2. Production of knowledge: the range of activities includes producing a manual, developing a database, conference proceedings, standards and guidelines, and research."

Dr Bell in turn recommended greater attention to goals, sub-goals and objectives and suggested a "checklist" for project proposals.

Economies differ in how they value the importance of projects. However, all agree that it would be much easier to assess the outputs of projects if (as Professor Kim and Dr Bell recommend) the TWG took a more strategic approach to project development.

In order to implement the "more strategic approach" called for in previous reviews, the TWG should switch from a "project" approach to a "program" approach. At present, various TWG projects are winding down and there are no new project proposals in the system to take their place. There is a hiatus. In a "program" approach, when one project finishes, new projects would be sought that continue the advance towards medium-term goals.

The desire for tourism projects and the desire for a more strategic approach to conceiving and funding tourism projects are evident in the comments from member economies:

"We have learnt a lot of experience about the tourism development from APEC ^&[] [{ a• , especially about eco-tourism, community-based tourism, human resource development, skill standards." (Vietnam)

"Thailand has been involved in TWG's research projects - i.e. impediments to tourism in APEC economies, and the risk and crisis management in tourism sector in Phuket. These projects have contributed in the academic aspects, with wider knowledge, but no further action or concrete plan." (Thailand).

“TWG could propose the tourism activity ideas to financial institutions or other funding sources” (Indonesia)

“Seek the funding from the NGOs and governmental funds of the rich economies (USA, Japan, Australia, Korea...) in APEC for the projects” (Vietnam)

“Cooperation among APEC members might be developed by economies in pairs, where both economies have common interests. However, APEC member shall be encouraged to extend their cooperation across the region of Asia and the Pacific as well” (Thailand)

10. Other TWG Activities

Recent non-project outcomes reported by the TWG to the SCE include:

- An APEC Conference “Capacity Building on Community Based Tourism as a Vehicle for Poverty Reduction and Dispersing Economic Benefits at the Local Level in Developing Member Economies” – Sandakan, Malaysia April 2009
- Collaboration with PATA and WTTC for mutual benefit
- An APEC-TWG Forum on the Developments in Cruise Tourism in the APEC region held in May 2009 in Singapore.
- Enhanced cooperation with other international organisations such as UNWTO, WTTC, ESCAP, UNESCO World Heritage Centre and the Getty Conservation Institute.

In 2009, the SCE explored the possibility of twinning arrangements (e.g. work placements and secondments) as a way to build capacity in the Asia Pacific. Other fora are experimenting with this concept.

At present, the reporting of outcomes seems to be entirely focused around APEC-funded projects. This alone could be acting as an impediment to seeking new ways to address the APEC’s tourism agenda. Adopting the “program” approach will also require change in reporting procedures. The reporting of tourism outcomes should be based on progress towards medium term tourism goals in addition to other, APEC-wide criteria. This will open the TWG’s agenda to new funding sources and expose the tourism agenda to new ways to make progress, without relying entirely on APEC project funding.

In the case of a twinning arrangement, for example, one of the twinned parties might fund an initiative that will contribute to one of the TWG’s program goals. A twinning arrangement between tourism training organisations, for example, could be managed by a networking organisation such as the Network of Asia-Pacific Education and Training (APETIT). The contribution of the TWG in this instance might be to coordinate high-level support from its member economies.

At a larger scale, one of the multinational organisations that regularly partner APEC – PATA, WTTC, UNWTO, ESCAP, UNESCO, etc – might drive a major project with no APEC funding but with the active support of the TWG because it addresses the Charter Goals. The TWG’s support could be as simple as holding project meetings on the sidelines of TWG meetings. The TWG could evolve other modalities of support for the activities of MOs in areas where the outcomes will contribute to TWG’s strategic goals.

Embracing projects and initiatives that are funded in ways other than by APEC project funding could be a major rejuvenating step forward for the TWG. These projects and initiatives could be incorporated into the TWG agenda and reporting processes in an equal manner to APEC-funded projects. This is another way by which a “program” approach could expand the TWG horizons.

11. Action Plans

The First APEC Meeting of Ministers Responsible for Tourism in July 2000 was very action oriented. Schedule 1 of the Tourism Charter listed procedures for the development of Individual Action Plans and Collective Action Plans and identification of issues for consideration by other APEC Fora pursuant to the Charter. A Nomination Phase was to be followed by a Response Phase, then a Monitoring, Research and Review Phase.

By the time of the Monitoring, Research and Review Phase (post 2007) the procedure going forward was supposed to be:

- “a. Economies to report annually in February:
 - i. against performance of individual and collective action plans
 - ii. nominating additions to individual action plans
 - iii. nominating additional issues for collective action plans and referral to other APEC fora for consideration by TWG.
- b. Delivery against action plans to be verified annually for report to TWG in October consistent with independent verification procedures employed elsewhere by APEC.
- c. TWG to confirm annually in May, changes to individual action plans and agree additions to collective action plans and issues for referral to other APEC fora.
- d. TWG to provide for a report to be delivered annually in October on emerging issues and trends in tourism to guide consideration of individual and collective action plans and issues identified to ensure and maintain the relevance of the Charter.”

Current practice is that projects and other activities are nominated on their own merits against APEC funding criteria and without reference to a TWG collective action plan. Collective action plans exist on APEC’s Trade and Investment Liberalisation and Facilitation (TILF) side, but not on the ECOTECH side.

Until recently, the TWG's nearest equivalent to a collective action plan was its Terms of Reference (TOR). The TOR were formalised at the 32nd TWG in 2008 in Lima, Peru. They begin with a vision statement recognising four points of rationale for cooperation:

- a. tourism is fast growing and significant in the region
- b. tourism is important in fostering understanding and cooperation
- c. our tourism industries are at different levels, and
- d. member economies share a common goal of quality in tourism

Ten objectives are then set, summarised as:

- a. to highlight the importance of tourism
- b. to facilitate the flow of visitors
- c. to investigate strategies for sustainable development
- d. to facilitate human resources development
- e. to cooperate in assuring safety and quality
- f. to develop strong relationships with the private sector
- g. to foster collaborative initiatives including other international bodies
- h. to liberalise tourism investment
- i. to facilitate the exchange of information
- j. to formulate and implement marketing and promotional programs.

These objectives usefully reflect the TWG's reasons for cooperating and for collective action around APEC projects. However, they do not relate to the Charter Goals.

The TOR go on to say that "the TWG will develop and implement its collective actions plan (sic) to ..." address the objectives, etc. After that, collective action plans are not mentioned again. Instead, the TOR refer to an annual workplan to be prepared by the TWG, submitted to the SCE, then reported against at the SCE's final meeting for the year. This is now the current practice.

The TWG's TOR and its annual workplans are the primary instruments for strategic planning at present. A collective action plan for the TWG, as envisaged in Schedule 1 of the Tourism Charter, seems to be a vital missing element. A TWG collective action plan could be a dynamic tool for tracking the TWG's progress towards the Charter Goals. Other tourism working groups in other regional groups (GMS, SASEC) make regular use of such a tool at every meeting.

A collective action plan matrix is required for the TWG to use as a practical tool for strategic planning. This could be a way to address Professor Kim's recommendations 1 and 9 and answer Dr Bell's recommendation for a "checklist" for assessing the relevance of TWG's projects. It would help in assessing and reporting outcomes. It would be the primary planning tool of a "programs" approach.

Member economies and MOs have indicated agreement that this would be a useful approach, but comments from member economies include strong and valid concerns about the time involved if this just becomes yet another "compliance exercise":

"Need a shift in emphasis from outputs (i.e the report) to outcomes (i.e what difference will the project make in achieving the implementation of the APEC tourism charter goals)" (NZ)

"The development of a strategic plan that would incorporate a collective action plan is extraordinarily resource-intensive. It takes a collective leadership effort to energise an overburdened delegation of the TWG. This alone could be an impediment to achieving the desired success." (US)

"There should not be a requirement or even expectations that all economies engage in every action. Many economies take quite different approaches to tourism development and the expectation that best practice in one economy will be universal across APEC can be difficult to achieve if not impossible." (NZ)

In 2009, the SCE's core group seemed to call for something similar to a collective action plan matrix when it asked for fora-specific medium term work plans. At the 36th TWG Meeting, the TWG discussed the development of a medium-term work plan. In modern APEC terminology, calling the planning tool a "medium-term work plan" is more apt than "collective action plan".

However, there is real and valid concern that this may become merely another compliance exercise. The SCE's view of the medium-term work plans is that they will "align with the SCE policy criteria" and "these plans should be taken into account in the project design, application and assessment". The template (June 2010 version) "Medium-Term Work Plan" being passed out to working groups by the APEC Secretariat is illustrated in Figure 1. Filling out this template could easily be construed as yet another requirement on the TWG to submit yet other workplan. There is no mention of its potential as a tool for the TWG.

Lessons from the experience of other tourism working groups in other regional groupings are useful in this regard. The GMS and SASEC tourism working groups use a simple matrix containing time-bound projects and other initiatives set within a framework of longer-term program goals. The matrix is updated in a simple way after each meeting, recording progress and any new decisions made. In this way the matrix is a working, evolving planning tool. The matrix does not have to be rewritten for reporting. Rather it can be submitted as is. An important side benefit is that the matrix serves to ensure that everyone at a meeting, even someone attending for the first time, appreciates the context of agenda items. It keeps the conversation focused.

A possible modified form of the Secretariat's template is suggested in Figure 2. Each strategic goal has its own "Program". Any number of "Projects / Action Items" can be listed for a Program. The "Projects / Action Items Outline" lists objectives and implementation steps. "Expected Outcomes" outlines the basis for measuring success. "Costs and Financing" indicate funding arrangements, providing for funding by APEC and by others. "Cooperating Parties" lists the organisations involved and their roles. "Key Issues" signal the immediate points for action or debate at meetings. In this form, the medium term work plan becomes an on-going, useful planning tool for the TWG and not merely a compliance exercise.

Figure 1. MEDIUM TERM WORKPLAN (SECRETARIAT'S TEMPLATE)
(2010 – 2015)

Name of the Group:

I. MEDIUM-TERM GOALS (please provide some explanation/description of the medium term goals that the group will work toward in order to facilitate achievement of APEC-wide strategic objectives)

II. WORK PROGRAM

GOALS/OBJECTIVES (PLEASE INDICATE THE ECOTECH PRIORITY WORKSTREAM THAT THEY SUPPORT)	ACTION ITEMS/SPECIFIC PROCESSES/ACTIVITIES	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	TIMEFRAME	COOPERATING PARTY (MO/OTHER APEC FORA)
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				

Name of the Group: Tourism Working Group

Goal One:
Goal Two:
Goal Three:

PROGRAM 1: HEADING (PROGRAM ONE RELATES TO GOAL ONE)				
PROJECT/ ACTION ITEM: 1.1 HEADING				
PROJECT/ ACTIVITY OUTLINE	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	COSTS AND FINANCING	COOPERATING PARTIES	KEY ISSUES
PROJECT/ ACTION ITEM: 1.2 HEADING				
PROJECT/ ACTIVITY OUTLINE	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	COSTS AND FINANCING	COOPERATING PARTIES	KEY ISSUES
PROGRAM 2: HEADING (PROGRAM TWO RELATES TO GOAL TWO)				
PROJECT/ ACTION ITEM: 2.1 HEADING				
PROJECT/ ACTIVITY OUTLINE	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	COSTS AND FINANCING	COOPERATING PARTIES	KEY ISSUES

12. Strategic Priorities

What then should the medium-term goals for tourism be?

In 2006, ten ECOTECH priorities to guide SCE's work were set, based on the Manila Declaration's six long-term APEC ECOTECH priority themes and the four medium-term APEC-wide ECOTECH priorities approved in 2003.

Long-term priorities:

- Developing human capital
- Developing stable and efficient markets through structural reform
- Strengthening economic infrastructure
- Facilitating technology flows and harnessing technologies for the future
- Safeguarding the quality of life through environmentally sound growth
- Developing and strengthening the dynamism of SMEs

Medium-term priorities:

- Integration into the Global Economy
- Human Security and Counter-terrorism Capacity Building
- Promoting the Development of Knowledge-Based Economies
- Addressing Social Dimension of Globalization

In 2009, the SCE's surveys of past capacity-building activities and the present capacity-building needs of developing APEC economies affirmed that these ten ECOTECH priorities remain appropriate and relevant. In particular, among the ten ECOTECH priorities, four areas were identified in the SCE sub-fora stocktake on capacity building needs as top priority areas for future ECOTECH activities (see 2009/SOM2/SCE/008). Thus, the SCE has proposed the overall focus of ECOTECH work and resources should be on:

- Regional Economic Integration
- Human Security
- Safeguarding the Quality of Life through Environmentally Sound Growth
- Addressing the Social Dimension of Globalisation

Priorities specifically for the tourism sector have been regularly addressed in the various levels of fora. The Hoi An Declaration on Promoting APEC Cooperation from the 4th Tourism Ministerial Meeting in 2006 raised very practical project ideas such as: an APEC Tourism Fair back to back with APEC events; an APEC Tourism Investment Forum on the sidelines of Ministerial Meetings; tour packages linking cultural heritage sites; joint activities for youth exchange; and a common international approach to Tourism Satellite Accounts.

The Pachacamac Declaration on Responsible Tourism in the Asia-Pacific Region in Lima, Peru in 2008 introduced the theme of responsible tourism and called for the promotion of: social inclusion and indigenous tourism; corporate social responsibility; environmental responsibility and climate change; cultural tourism; and aviation connectivity.

The TWG's 2010 Workplan (2010/SOM1/SCE-COW/014) reflects up-to-the-minute thinking on priorities for APEC cooperation in tourism. The assessor suggests that the TWG's 2010 Workplan could be recast using terms from the Manila Framework, basing the TWG's Medium Term Work Plan around 6 programs:

1. Asserting tourism's place

Medium term goal: "to assert tourism's place in regional economic integration"

- promoting recognition of the economic importance of tourism
- ensuring the tourism sector's voice is considered (e.g. in climate change)
- recognising tourism as a vehicle for economic and social development
- promulgating tools for asserting tourism's importance (e.g. TSA)
- promoting integration into the global tourism industry

2. Human capital in tourism

Medium term goal: "to promote human security through developing human capital in tourism"

- tourism capacity building (multi-year program)
- promoting education and training in tourism
- broadening community participation in tourism
- strengthening tourism's small and medium enterprises (SMEs)
- promoting tourism's contribution to the development of knowledge-based economies

3. Socially and culturally responsible tourism

Medium term goal: "to address the social dimension of globalisation through socially and culturally responsible tourism"

- fostering inclusive growth in tourism
- promoting spreading the benefits of tourism
- promoting best practices in community-based tourism
- fostering assistance to small-scale accommodation operators
- promoting tourism as a tool for reducing poverty
- addressing tourism influence on the social dimensions of globalisation

4. Environmentally sound tourism

Medium term goal: "to safeguard the quality of life through environmentally sound tourism"

- promoting environmentally sustainable tourism methods
- facilitating flows of clean technologies
- harnessing energy efficient technologies for the future
- conservation and preservation of environment
- including social and cultural issues

5. Policy alignment and reform

Medium term goal: "To promote stability and efficiency in tourism through policy alignment and structural reform"

- building convergences of national policies
- addressing barriers to cross border tourism flows
- addressing barriers to cross border trade in services
- statistical improvements in measuring tourism

6. Coordination with other fora

Medium term goal: “To expand the scope of the TWG’s influence through collaboration and coordination with other APEC fora”

- identifying cross-cutting issues
- energy / climate change
- emergency preparedness
- culture
- policy around trade in services

A list of medium-term programs such as this, each with an explicit goal, would provide the TWG with a framework for maintaining its focus internally and for making its own agenda clear when it reaches out to others seeking contributions or program alignment.

The Lead Shepherd is currently soliciting suggestions from the member economies for expanding the TWG’s goals. Fitting the new goals around a series of medium-term programs in the manner illustrated above is recommended in order to turn the TWG’s Medium-Term Work Plan into a useful, on-going tool.

Of course, an important feature of APEC is that APEC-wide priorities regularly come down from above. There must be room to factor in year-by-year priorities. In 2009, for example, APEC Leaders, Ministers and Senior Officials agreed that the most pressing priority was the Global Economic Crisis. APEC fora were requested to focus on APEC’s core business and:

- advance free and open trade and investment (Bogor Goals)
- accelerate APEC’s Regional Economic Integration (REI) agenda
- intensify work on structural reform

Alignment with APEC’s immediate priorities should be accommodated at the Projects and Action Points level, rather than requiring major upheaval to the programs in the TWG’s Medium Term Work Plan.

These notions were put to member economies in the Preliminary Report. Reactions ranged from useful policy suggestions, to agreement that without its own agenda, tourism will not be given priority and the TWG will not be in a position to lead:

“The development of a regional position on policy issues would inherently require the involvement of non-APEC parties.” (Australia)

“The assessment should also revisit the TWG policy goals and their relevance – are they anachronistic now? (Australia)

“There needs to be a clear integration of how the TWG current and future goals serve the ECOTECH priorities and, more importantly, the new APEC growth strategy. It would be useful to have a presentation by a member of the ECOTECH Secretariat at a future TWG meeting to ensure clear coordination.” (US)

“One of the paradoxes is that APEC often focuses on barriers to trade and harmonisation of regulation. Tourism is one of the least regulated sectors and therefore the APEC imperatives often seem in contrast or do not align well with some other APEC priorities at times.” (NZ)

“Regulatory controls on tourism, such as border security, appear to be derived from well outside the sector and are then applied in an inconsistent pattern across APEC.” (NZ)

“Many impediments have been found from the research, but the solutions are not in the authority of a national tourism administration to implement. They need high levels of support from other APEC fora - i.e, transportation, immigration etc.” (Thailand)

“APEC is a wide region with different interest, different time zones, different languages and different limitations of distance. Therefore, the TWG should find specific regional issues relevant to the Asia-Pacific region that most member economies can share benefit from, in accordance with their own current problems. Examples could be the global economic crisis and recovery policy, climate change and the impact on tourism, green tourism etc.” (Thailand)

“Sharing information and exchanging knowledge after research has been conducted should be emphasised. For example, APEC’s TOSS project helped us to develop our standards and skills and the TSA project help provinces to develop regional TSAs” (Indonesia)

13. Engaging with Other Agendas

Collaboration with other fora has been a long-standing agenda for the TWG. The Singapore Cruise Forum was an excellent example. Having its own agenda set out clearly in a TWG Medium Term Work Plan, as proposed above, will give renewed impetus to reaching out to other fora.

Leveraging on partnerships with MOs is currently the topic of much debate within APEC. As noted above, the lack of leveraging on the agendas of others is a striking difference between the way the APEC TWG conducts its business and the modalities of other tourism workings. Regional groupings that do not have a secretariat rely heavily on “development partners”, frequently MOs, to drive and co-ordinate action in between meetings. Even some with a secretariat (eg GMS), will frequently have projects assisted by a development partner with a complementary agenda. In the past, APEC as a whole has not reached out to seek complementary agendas. However, it is now moving in this direction. This could an important new avenue for rejuvenating the TWG.

In 2008, an Australian paper (“08_sce1_012_Draft Report on APEC multilateral engagement sur.doc”) analysed the past engagement of APEC fora with MOs and concluded that it works best when projects involve:

- i) issues requiring international and collective action, and
- ii) issues that are new to all economies and evolving rapidly.

In 2009, the SCE conducted a Dialogue on APEC's Engagement with Multilateral Organisations. ("09_sce1_013_090217 summary report to SCE."). This meeting addressed enhancing APEC's engagement with MOs and the private sector and the implementation of multi-year projects. Soon after, APEC met with ADB, FAO, IADB, IMF, OECD, and the WB. This resulted in recommendations that APEC should, in the first instance, target ASEAN Secretariat, UNWTO, OECD and the WB for closer links. It also resulted in a call for centralised Fora Points of Contact to coordinate inter-organisational cooperation.

In 2010, the SCE started implementing these decisions. Recognising there is room for improvement in APEC's collaboration with MOs, the private sector in general and with the APEC Business Advisory Council (ABAC) in particular, SCE has requested:

- all fora to look critically at the recently revised invitation and approval guidelines to non-member participation. Are the guidelines flexible enough to facilitate more strategic engagement?
- each Working Group to establish a point of contact – consideration should be given to the Program Directors to act as a Contact Point.
- a centralised point of contact in the APEC Secretariat to coordinate inter-organisational cooperation.
- Identification of ways to promote closer cooperation with multilateral organisations, including ASEAN and other APEC observers.

In 2010, the SCE's Progress Report on Implementation of Recommendations on Strengthening Engagement with Multilateral Organisations ("10_sce1_004_Progress report on cooperation with MOs") contained discussion on fora points of contact with MOs. It was noted that the high turnover of Chairs/Lead Shepherds and economy representatives inhibits the ability to establish and develop strong relationships with MOs.

The Lead Shepherd is the point of contact for the TWG. The Program Director supporting the Dialogue with Multilateral Organisations (previously Mr Sun Tao) now serves as the centralised point of contact (CPOC) in the Secretariat to facilitate communication and exchanges of information between APEC Fora and MOs contact points.

The assessor has noted that whenever the issue of engaging with the private sector arises, the typical response is to consider a role for the APEC Business Advisory Council (ABAC). However, as mentioned above, tourism typically involves governance through some form of PPP, usually a tourism board of some kind. This private sector focus is reflected at global and regional levels in the make up of tourism's MOs such as WTTC and PATA. Tourism boards and MOs are likely to be better avenues for engaging tourism's private sector than the ABAC.

Anecdotal inquiry confirms that the APEC TWG currently has low standing within the private sector of tourism. Notwithstanding this, it is reasonable to suggest that sometime in the future it could be a characteristic of TWG projects that the private

sector is always effectively engaged. If this happens, the TWG could turn around its current reputation with the private sector. If this does not happen, APEC's standing in the real, private sector-led world of tourism will continue to languish and any rejuvenation of the TWG will be hollow.

The most obvious place to start engagement with MOs and the private sector is the TWG's loyal guest MOs. Rather than "allowing" these MOs to attend, they should be embraced as full participants at meetings. Rather than "guest MOs", they should become "partner MOs". The TWG's Mid-Term Work Plan should be put before the TWG's partner MOs and an open invitation issued to PATA and WTTC in particular (and any others who prove their commitment by attending regularly) for joint participation in projects or other action points where there is a mutual interest.

It is possible that PATA and WTTC will have joint initiatives to suggest. They should be free to do so, even if to fit within APEC rules they may still need to persuade an individual member economy to champion the idea. The TWG should turn to PATA and WTTC for advice in reaching out to the private sector in projects and action points initiated by others and in other ways seek opportunities for complementary activities with PATA and WTTC in the region.

Irrespective of where an initiative comes from, the potential for leadership by a partner MO should be explored. TWG's partner MOs have technical personnel with full-time responsibilities for multilateral engagement. For a Lead Shepherd to fit intersessional technical coordination of multilateral projects between his / her national priorities is extremely onerous. The Secretariat's Program Director or the common Contact Point in the Secretariat for MOs is going to be hard pressed to co-ordinate the technical side of joint projects.

These are very good reasons to overturn the prevailing notion that "APEC must be in control". There is too much to gain from allowing MOs to lead, co-ordinate and oversee joint projects. At present, the reality is that things get done when a member economy instructs and oversees a consultant who leads and co-ordinates. So much more could be done if the instruction and oversight comes from a MO with a multilateral agenda of its own to justify time spent in such leadership.

The SCE's 2010 framework (2010/SOM1/R/017) Strengthening Economic and Technical Cooperation in APEC notes that demand for project funding significantly exceeds the supply and the magnitude of voluntary contributions will be considered as a factor in decisions about projects. As the TWG moves further into joint projects, more opportunities for co-funding are likely to arise. Consideration should be given to weighing the supply and magnitude of co-funding as a factor in decisions about APEC projects.

Because of the private-sector-led nature of tourism, it is not surprising that there was a consensus among questionnaire respondents around the idea that the TWG could be the first of APEC's fora to embrace the SCE's calls for: inviting the private sector to attend meetings; organising policy dialogues; and developing working relationships with the business sector. Respondents also commented on the need for cross fertilisation of agendas within APEC, collaboration with the tourism working groups of other regional groups, and the prospects for co-funding of projects and other activities with MOs and others.

“The first step to developing synergies between the work of TWG and various relevant APEC fora would be to identify common goals and issues.” (Aus)

“Work with the OECD to mutually support each other’s programs of work, as many of the items overlap. As both tourism working groups hold meetings twice yearly, it would be easy to support OECD activities and to hold collaborative workshops. Pursue joint project work with WTTC, PATA, ABAC and the private sector. This could include engaging in public-private sector seminars on the margins of a TWG meeting.” (US)

“Joint workshops on the margins of TWG meetings; having a presence at more international organisation meetings; providing input into projects and work plans of other international organisations; having a representative from the private sector present on an issue of importance at TWG meetings; initiating joint projects with private sector organisations, such as a review of barriers to tourism.” (US)

“UNWTO is quite active in the statistics and training area. TWG could/should work closely with the Asia Regional office rather than attempt to duplicate any work. PATA and WTTC are other organisations that could have concurrent meetings in the region and back these onto TWG working group activities.” (NZ)

“Global partnerships and networking could be explored, such as with non-profit organisation that can provide experts or technical assistance such as KENAN in Thailand. Furthermore, APEC TWG may cooperate with UNEP regarding “Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism” in order to explore new funding opportunities for developing sustainable practices.” (Thailand)

“Yes, APEC members should seek more cooperation with UN agencies, especially those in member economies without APEC fund, in accordance with the Tourism Charter goals. For instance, UNEP is now focusing on tourism management for sustainable tourism development. Training on best practices, and other area of cooperation to promote green tourism in the Asia-Pacific can be further explored and developed. UNEP is now joining with regional bloc like ASEAN to promote sustainable tourism in the region.” (Thailand)

“We do not agreed if the words “greater involvement” will mean MOs can have “greater intervention” in the TWG. We prefer a “cooperation and collaboration” approach. (Indonesia)

“We need seminars or workshops to get the perspectives of non APEC parties in regard to collaboration in research projects” (Indonesia)

“We suggest real projects to implement community-based tourism and pro-poor tourism.” (Vietnam)

“We suggest priority opportunities for collaboration in: marketing and promotion; investment promotion; and tourism product development” (Vietnam)

14. Gender Issues

From the evidence of the 36th TWG Meeting and conversations with member economies and MOs, the TWG appears to be taking good account of APEC's commitment to give gender greater consideration. In many member economies, the benefits of tourism development fall relatively equally. The TWG should continue to take a leadership role within APEC on gender issues.

Respondents to the questionnaire generally agreed:

"The tourism industry in particular does employ a large number of women. This fact could be turned into a study or a workshop with women in the tourism industry speaking about what they do and their perspectives on the industry and about gender considerations in the industry. Having female Lead Shepherds in the TWG set a fine example for APEC." (US)

"Quality tourism shall be explored in order to promote women's role in promoting responsible tourism. In addition, APEC may work with other inter-organisation bodies, such as UNWTO and UNIFEM (United Nations Fund for Women), to cooperatively encourage and foster women to involve in tourism activities in both national and international levels." (Thailand)

"We should organise training courses on tourism for female staff. Doing the research on the participation of female in sustainable tourism development, implement the projects in order to bring the benefit for the female when they participate in tourism activities." (Vietnam)

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

INTRODUCTION

A review of the APEC Tourism Working Group (TWG) was undertaken between June and September 2010. Part of this review entailed a survey of the 21 member economies. The results of this survey are presented by this appendix document but should be read in conjunction with the main report.

Rather than follow a conventional quantitative survey approach, the survey provided the context, background and key issues that the review sought to address. Survey questions were provided after the context and issues were explained. This enabled economies and multilateral partners to offer more informed responses.

Twelve TWG members and one multilateral partner responded to the survey. Copies of the survey were sent out from the APEC Secretariat on 14 July 2010 with a response due on 30 July. A reminder notice was sent out on 26 July 2010 to increase the response rate.

Responses were received from:

TWG Members	Multilateral Organizations
Australia	APEC International Centre for Sustainable Tourism (AICST)
Indonesia	
Japan	
Chinese Taipei	
Thailand	
USA	
Vietnam	
New Zealand	
Philippines	
Brunei	
Malaysia	
Peru	

The format of this appendix report is framed around the order of questions as they appeared in the survey. An extract from the background provided in the survey questionnaire is shown first followed by the survey question. The analysis then summarises the responses from each economy.

Q1. Background

Rather than conducting a questionnaire style survey, it will be more effective to give members an opportunity to contribute to the substance of the Draft Report. When the Draft Report is later circulated, responses can focus on fine-tuning and adding value.

Has this combined survey and report method allowed you to make a meaningful contribution to the substance of the Draft Report?

Analysis

All but one of the member economies and one multilateral organisation were in favour of the survey method used. Of the comments that were made, New Zealand was thoroughly in favour of the method used noting “excellent approach that ensures context to the responses made.”

Q2. Background

The current assessment should not merely repeat the analysis of previous reviews, the findings of which remain relevant. Rather, it should build on where those reviews finished.

Do you have any reason to wish that an aspect (e.g. the detailed questionnaire survey and the sector analysis) of the previous reviews be repeated?

Analysis

Two member economies wished that aspects of the previous reviews be repeated. Ten member economies and the multilateral organisation did not wish aspects of the previous reviews be repeated.

Indonesia and Thailand made comments in favour of seeing aspects of the previous review being repeated. This included that “some aspects are still appropriate to use, such as recommendations [as these] have not yet been applied.”

Thailand was in favour of seeing aspects of previous reports be repeated and made a suggestion in regard to Professor Kim’s third recommendation, “the TWG should amend the standard agenda for its meetings to include a number of sessions focussing on key issues impacting on tourism in the APEC region.”

Thailand suggested that due to the disparities between the regions within APEC, regional perspectives on issues should be shared to bridge the gap of understanding between these regions - “most of the members could share benefits in accordance with their current problems, such as the global economic crisis and recovery policy, climate change and the impact on tourism, and green tourism etc.”

On reflection, there may have been a degree of misunderstanding of this question. Thailand and Indonesia’s comments suggest that findings from the previous detailed quantitative survey have not been resolved and that this review should endorse and reinforce the recommendations of the previous reviews. The areas of unfinished business referred to by Thailand and Indonesia are indeed addressed by this assessment.

Q3. Background

Judging from the previous reviews and the briefings received to date, the best contribution this assessment can make is to suggest practical ways to improve the operations of the TWG. This will help fulfil the SCE’s mandate and continue the impetus of the previous reviews.

Do you agree that the main focus of this assessment should be on finding ways to improve the operations of the TWG?

Analysis

Eleven member economies and the multilateral organisation agreed that the main focus of the assessment should be on ways to improve operations of the TWG.

Two of the four respondents who provided comments, agreed that the main focus of the assessment should be on ways to improve operations of the TWG, and each respondent made some suggestions.

Australia suggested that, “the assessment should also revisit the TWG policy goals and their relevance.” Australia also believed that the objective of the assessment should be to improve TWG outcomes to make them more relevant.

On a similar theme, the US noted that, “there needs to be a clear integration of how the TWG current and future goals serve the ECOTECH priorities and, more importantly, the new APEC growth strategy.” A presentation by an ECOTECH secretariat member at a TWG meeting is suggested as one way of ensuring better coordination of ECOTECH priorities and TWG goals.

New Zealand would like to see an improvement in the selection process for projects and their implementation, and that the emphasis should shift from outputs to outcomes such as assessing “what difference will the project make in achieving the implementation of the AEC tourism charter goals?” as opposed to the reports themselves.

Thailand was not sure that the focus of the assessment should be on finding ways to improve the operations of the TWG. This was based on their comment to question two, the disparities between the regions within APEC. They suggest that activities such as, “human resource training, tourism fairs and exhibitions, seminars, workshops or joint promotion campaigns, exchange of people at all levels specifically youth and business people,” would help the effective operation of the TWG.

Q4. Background

The Tourism Charter Goals provide a comprehensive framework for planning the TWG’s activities. The goals remain relevant – attested by Professor Kim and Dr Bell – and should continue as the foundations of the TWG’s mandate.

Are the four Charter Goals still relevant and should they continue as the TWG foundations?

Analysis

Ten member economies and one multilateral organisation agreed that the charter goals are still relevant and should continue as the TWG foundations. One member economy did not agree and one was not sure.

Australia believes the goals need revision especially Goal 2 “Increase mobility of visitors and demand for tourism goods and services in the APEC region,” and Goal 4, “Enhance recognition and understanding of tourism as a vehicle for economic and social development.” The US generally agrees that the charter goals are still relevant although noted that the Lead Shepherd is collecting suggestions for expanding the goals. Brunei is not sure if the charter goals still remain relevant and feels they need to be reviewed in order to reflect changes in the tourism global scenario.

Q5. Background

Member economies seem to have at least five reasons for attending TWG meetings and they judge the success of the meetings accordingly:

- 1. Political obligation*
- 2. Cooperation and collaboration*
- 3. Information sharing*
- 4. Development assistance to member economies*
- 5. Projects are valuable*

Please list up to 5 other motivating reasons and rank all reasons for attending that are especially appropriate for your member economy?

Analysis

Of the five motivating reasons that were provided in the survey, “cooperation and collaboration”, and “information sharing” seem to be the most valued reasons to attend TWG meetings.

Other reasons that were added to the list included themes of “networking opportunities”, “international relations”, “lobbying on issues”, “being exposed to best practice examples (for instance Tourism Satellite Accounts and discovering new entrepreneurial approaches)”, “socialising” and engaging with other cultures”, “development of small and medium enterprises” and “development of human capital in tourism”.

Australia added and placed importance on “development and maintenance of bilateral relations” and “lobbying on cross cutting issues such as the treatment of aviation emissions.”

Thailand added “international forum that provides best practice”, “platform for members to learn other cultures”, “socialization among members”, “political networking”, “opportunity to create mutual understanding” and “networking with experienced and expert people” as other motivating reasons.

“Competing work commitments” and “limited resources” were two reasons why New Zealand was not able to attend some of the previous TWG meetings. New Zealand also pointed out the unspecified meeting agenda made it difficult to decide if attending the meeting would be worthwhile.

A summary of economy responses is provided in the following table:

Responses to Q5

[illegible]

Multilateral Organizations	AICST											
Political Obligation	4											
Cooperation and collaboration												
Information sharing	2											
Development assistance to member economies	1											
Projects are valuable												
<i>To participate in meetings and TWG business*</i>	3											

* Indicates motivating factors added by the respondent

Q6. Background

While TWG members seem to value projects highly, it would be very much easier to assess the outputs of projects if the TWG took a more strategic approach to project development.

Do you see “taking a strategic approach to project development” as a high priority?

Analysis

Eleven member economies and one multilateral organisation agreed that “taking a strategic approach to project development” is a high priority, the remaining member economy was not sure.

Those agreeing that ‘taking a strategic approach’ was a high priority for the TWG made comments including: the need for improved commitment from members, the vital delivery of project outputs, projects to be driven by knowledgeable providers, the need to address the funding structure, Lead Shepherds needing to be engaged for a longer term and being more active in the role and that member economies should send more senior officials to meetings ensuring more decisive action from the TWG.

New Zealand notes that projects should deliver on outcomes rather than reports, and that providers who understand the context of the work should deliver projects. It is suggested that APEC reassess its funding structure, and moves away from the traditional published documents and workshops, to ways that incorporate more online methods.

AICST believes that the problem of maintaining a strategic approach in the past came down to the short terms of the Lead Shepherds, noting that a one-year term did not enable effective leadership. AICST hopes that the current leadership will be a two-year term and will regain a strategic leadership role. AICST also notes that people of different levels attending from each member economy inhibits the strategic agenda, commenting that “the rank/seniority of member representatives attending TWG meetings is an issue. If all economies sent senior representative who were more knowledgeable and experienced and could make reasonable decisions, it would improve the effectiveness of TWG activities. As would the same person attending over a period of time.”

Thailand was not sure as to whether taking a strategic approach should be classed as a high priority. In relation to Policy Goal 1 “Remove impediments to tourism business and investment” they note that many impediments have been found from the research, but it is not up to the national tourism authority to deal with them, and that certain barriers need to be addressed with the help of other APEC fora.

Malaysia notes that it is not necessarily the capacity building projects that provide immediate changes in the Member Economies, that it mainly comes down to the jurisdiction and segregation of bodies involved. They do

however see merit in the projects especially in terms of human resource training and capital.

Q7. Background

A more strategic approach to planning the TWG's activities could help in developing activities other than APEC-funded projects. The TWG could support the activities of other Multilateral Organizations in areas where the outcomes will contribute to TWG's strategic goals.

Do you think supporting the activities of others could be a useful new direction for the TWG?

Analysis

Nine member economies and one multilateral organisation agreed that supporting the activities of others could be a useful direction for TWG, the remaining three member economies were not sure.

Member economies that were in favour of supporting activities of others provided an array of suggestions as to how this could be done. Australia suggested "development of an industry position on the treatment of aviation emissions and climate change", while Indonesia thought that "sharing information and exchange of knowledge by each research conducted" is important.

The US and New Zealand noted that the TWG could work more closely with the OECD as many items on their respective tourism agendas overlap.

New Zealand recommended that the TWG should work closely with the UNWTO Asia Regional office, to save on duplication of research and training resources. The US and New Zealand both suggested that since PATA and WTTC have concurrent meetings in the region, these meetings could be backed with TWG working group activities.

Thailand thinks APEC members, in accordance with the Charter Goals, should seek cooperation with the UN agencies that have regional offices in the member economies without an APEC fund.

Malaysia suggests collaboration with ASEAN's ATIF (ASEAN Tourism Investment Forum) to assist in dissemination of current levels of liberalisation of services and to assist in promoting other APEC Member Economies.

AICST agrees that supporting the activities of others is important as long as the support meets the TWG strategic objectives, and is not just a response to an ad hoc request. AICST notes:

"Supporting and cooperating with others is important if it meets the strategic TWG objectives and is not just a reaction to a request. APEC does not have sufficient or appropriate funding or funding mechanisms for larger projects

(over USD50,000), so other funding organisations or cooperating on funding is important. Too many TWG projects have been structured to be less than USD50, 000 to meet the APEC funding approval criteria. Too many TWG projects have been put forward by TWG members on behalf of consultants in their economies. The APEC endorsement process deters disagreement on matters unless they are serious, so it is easier to 'go along' with ideas put forward in the absence of an agreed strategic agenda."

Q8. Do you see value in pursuing the idea of a collective action plan for the TWG?

Analysis

All respondents (members and multilateral organizations) see value in pursuing the idea of a collective action plan for the TWG, subject to some conditions.

New Zealand's response mentions that it shouldn't be necessary for all economies to engage in every action, as different economies are working within different frameworks and regulations. The AICST mentions that the plan needs to consider that tourism is not susceptible to the same barriers as trade generally. The US notes that preparation of a collective action plan would be a challenge for the TWG as most members have little time to devote to its preparation outside of TWG meetings. The constraint on delegates' time may also hamper implementation of the plan. These factors should be addressed when putting the plan together.

New Zealand also mentioned difficulties with the previous reporting obligations, noting "the previous reporting obligation was difficult to fulfil as many of the best practice projects produced recommendations that did not relate to national regulatory or marketing approaches and this means that the document ended up being a compliance exercise rather than a driver of better performance."

On balance, there is strong support for a collective action plan and the realities of time constraints need to be addressed, as these will underpin the anticipated success of such a plan.

Q9. Background

To be useful, the TWG's collective action plan must i) be founded on the Tourism Charter Goals, ii) reflect TWG's up-to-the-minute priorities, and iii) be flexible enough to align with APEC's immediate priorities.

In 2009, the Core Group seemed to call for exactly such a tool when it encouraged fora-specific medium term plans that align with the SCE Policy Criteria and noted that these plans should be taken into account in the project design, application and assessment.

Do these parameters concur with your idea of what a TWG collective action plan might be like?

Analysis

Eleven member economies and one multilateral organisation agreed with the proposed parameters of the TWG collective action plan, the remaining member economy (Australia) did not agree. Australia noted that the policy goals need revision and, by implication, this will affect development of a collective action plan.

Responses suggest that the parameters for the action plan require some further discussion. For instance, New Zealand notes that, “while APEC often focuses on barriers to trade and harmonization of regulation, tourism is one of the least regulated sectors and therefore the APEC imperatives often seem in contrast or do not align well with some of the APEC priorities at times.” It is also interesting to note that many of the regulations affecting the tourism sector are often derived from outside the sector (such as homeland security) and then applied inconsistently across APEC economies. The AICST also concurs with these views.

Overall, responses to this question indicate that parameters (ii) and (iii) above are laudable although not without challenges. ‘Up to the minute priorities’ suggest that TWG would always be in a position to act swiftly and to have relevant research data on-hand to inform decisions. This has proven difficult to achieve in the past, although there have been some exceptions, such as the way in which APEC moved on the European proposals to tax travel and airlines for ostensibly environmental reasons. Ideally, the TWG should be in a position to influence regulations before they come into effect.

Q10. Background

Other tourism working groups have succeeded in leveraging off the agendas of other Multilateral Organizations. Also, because of the private sector nature of tourism, perhaps the TWG should be the first of APEC’s fora to embrace the SCE’s call for inviting the private sector to attend meetings, organize policy dialogues and develop working relationships with the business sector?

Would you like to see a greater involvement of multinational organizations and the tourism private sector with the TWG?

Analysis

Of the twelve responses to this question, nine member economies would like to see greater involvement of other Multinational Organizations and the tourism private sector with the TWG. The multilateral organisation and Chinese Taipei were unsure, and one member economy (Indonesia) did not agree.

Indonesia's concern was the need for more clarity around the meaning of "greater involvement". It could be taken as multinational organisations having greater intervention. Indonesia suggested the phrase "cooperation and collaboration" instead.

New Zealand noted that TWG already engages with the private sector by including WTTC and PATA at its ministerial meetings, but does agree that TWG meetings could take on more of an open forum component with other organisations. Further private sector engagement would be welcomed if it were in accordance with the strategic work plan of the TWG.

Members also recognise the value in meeting with other APEC working groups. Obvious synergies exist between the TWG and the Transport Working Group. Thus, a combined meeting of the two working groups with IATA and ICAO sitting in would be beneficial in terms of aviation.

In a cautionary way, AICST questions the effectiveness of the engagement with multi-lateral organisations such as WTTC and PATA. It notes that the agenda and goals of including additional private sector organisations should be defined clearly before the offer is extended to include more.

Q11. Background

The remaining questions were designed for members to suggest general improvements to the TWG.

Please describe in one paragraph the overall impact of the TWG's work program "on the ground" in your economy over the last decade.

Analysis

Ways in which the work of the TWG has impacted member economies include:

- Developed standard skills and enabled the development of a regional TSA
- Tourism occupational standards helped with training and skills development
- Provided best practise examples to improve regional economic performance
- Being the chairman of a priority goal raised the status of the member economy in the international arena
- People from the tourism sector who were involved have learnt best practise
- Project work has contributed to better understanding and cooperation
- Have learnt more on topics such as ecotourism, community based tourism, human resource development and skill standards.

- Have served to initiate various guidelines and best practices of national tourism products

A few members noted that apart from one or two TWG project activities, there has been little tangible benefit to their economies.

Q12. Please suggest in one paragraph ways the TWG can better take into account the APEC commitment to give gender greater consideration?

Analysis

There seems to be disparity between the respondents on whether gender is an issue for tourism. Some felt it was not.

Of those that feel gender is an issue, ways that are suggested to give the issue greater consideration include; capacity building for female labour, work with UNWTO and UNIFEM to encourage women to be involved with tourism activities, that the TWG should formulate and identify tourism programmes that will highlight gender development, and the provision of tourism training courses for females and a study or a workshop with women in the tourism industry speaking about what they do and their perspectives on the industry and about gender considerations.

Another suggestion was to determine whether gender is a major issue for tourism in order to identify the actions needed to deal with it.

The US notes that having female Lead Shepherds in the TWG sets a fine example for APEC.

Malaysia believes that the TWG has always given gender equality great consideration and care, and that the current practices should be sustained to ensure long-term yield for projects.

Q13. Please suggest in one paragraph ways to develop synergies among the work of TWG and various relevant APEC fora?

Analysis

Suggestions from respondents included:

- Identify common goals/priorities and issues that are resourced and time limited to achieve the desired outcomes
- Inform other APEC fora of TWG activities
- Prioritise the TWG agenda and engage with other fora, to deliver on the priority work programme
- Align the priorities with priorities of other fora to develop synergies

- Develop commitment at ministerial level to enable synergy, especially in the areas of transportation, culture and foreign affairs
- Discuss with other agencies to remove the obstacles of travel facilitation especially visa and custom procedures
- Better leadership and involvement of the Lead Shepherd
- Provide input to various undertakings among relevant APEC fora
- Back to back meetings for TWG and other working groups in order to discuss the cross cutting issues

The US provides a good example of how to develop synergies with other APEC fora, commenting that:

“Joint projects are a good place to begin – the ecotourism project is a good example. Other topics the TWG is focusing on, emergency preparedness for example, would definitely benefit from collaboration with other working groups, such as the Health Working Group. Sustainable tourism is also a priority and the TWG could benefit from more collaboration with the energy group. Finally, as most tourism companies are SMEs, there should definitely be more collaboration with that forum.”

Q14. Please suggest in one paragraph any specific opportunities you see for greater collaboration with non-APEC parties, including the private sector, civil society and other international organisations.

Analysis

Organisations that are suggested for collaboration include the private sector, UNEP, tourism associations and TMM.

Suggested ways in which collaboration could eventuate include:

- project work
- development of a regional position on policy issues
- seminars or workshops coinciding with TWG meetings
- marketing and promotion
- investment and tourism product development
- having a presence at more international organization meetings
- providing input into projects and work plans of other international organizations
- having a representative from the private sector present on an issue of importance at TWG meetings
- initiating joint projects with private sector organizations, such as a review of barriers to tourism
- providing working solutions to the problems that affect the multi strata of the tourism industry

- gaining more relevant correspondence, cooperation, support and financial assistance from the private sector

Q15. Please suggest in one paragraph ways for the TWG to tap other new resources for its activities.

Analysis

Suggestions include:

- promote the importance of tourism within member economies more effectively
- align project priorities to member economies to allow member economies to commit additional funding
- explore global partnerships and or private sector sponsorship
- extend the current pool of resources to newly developed economies as new economic members, or in terms of expertise and human resource development

Most respondents felt there is reasonable potential to tap new resources for TWG activities. In particular, New Zealand notes:

“Given the size of touring in APEC as an economic force additional resources should be able to be found – and partly the reason why this is difficult can be found in the limited assertions of the importance of Tourism in APEC economies. Strengthened action around asserting tourism’s importance in the global economy would assist in this regard. The obvious example recently has been the volcanic ash effects in Europe and the resulting economic consequences of this disruption to normal visitor flows.”

Appendix 2: TWG Projects

TWG projects: Operational Account

No.	Project No.	Title	Year
1.	TWG 01/2001	Best Practices on Development of Tourism Satellite Accounts	2001
2.	TWG 02/2001	Tourism Research Network	2001
3.	TWG 04/2001	Tourism Impediments Stage 1	2001
4.	TWG 01/2002	Tourism Occupational Skill Standard Development in the APEC Region Stage III	2002
5.	TWG 01/2003	Small to Medium Size Tourism Business Development Needs	2003
6.	TWG 02/2003	Best Practices and Ideas in Safety and Security for APEC Economies to combat terrorism in tourism	2003
7.	TWG 01/2004	Tourism Impediments Stage 2	2004
8.	TWG 01/2005	Tourism Occupational Skill Standard Development in the APEC Region Stage IV	2005
9.	TWG 02/2005	Best Practices In Sustainable Tourism Management Initiatives For APEC Economies	2005
10.	TWG 01/2006	Strengthening Safety & Security Best Practices Against Terrorism For Sustainable Tourism Development	2006
11	TWG 01/2008A	Training on the Application of APEC Skill Standard Concept and System	2008
12	TWG 02/2008A	Capacity Building on Community Based Tourism As A Vehicle For Poverty Reduction and Dispersing Economic Benefits At The Local Level in Developing Member Economies	2008
13	TWG 01/2009A	Best Practices in Key Rural Tourism Resources Managed by Local Communities. (e.g. Thermal Resources)	2009
14	TWG 02/2009A	Identification of best practice in the Use of clean technologies as a main source of energy in hostelry (e.g. Rural Hostelry)	2009
15	TWG 04/2009A	Best practice management of visitor carrying capacity issues for cultural, heritage and natural sites in the APEC region.	2009

TWG projects: TILF Special Account

No.	Project No.	Title	Year
1.	TWG 01/2001T	Tourism Information Network	2001
2.	TWG 02/2001T	Application of Electronic Commerce to Small & Medium Tourism Enterprises in APEC Member Economies	2001
3.	TWG 03/2001T	Best Business Practices for access to Tourists with Restricted Physical Ability	2001
4.	TWG 04/2001T	Training for Sustainable Development in the Tourism Industry	2001
5.	TWG 05/2001T	Public-Private Partnership for Sustainable Tourism	2001
6.	TWG 01/2004T	Public and Private Partnership for Facilitating Tourism Investment in the APEC Member Economies	2004
7.	TWG 02/2004T	Exploring Best Practices of E-Commerce Application to the SMTEs in the APEC Region	2004
8.	TWG 01/2006T	Tourism Impediments Stage 3	2006
9.	TWG 01/2008T	Capacity Building on Tourism Satellite Account as basis for promoting liberalization and facilitation on tourism services	2008