



Asia-Pacific  
Economic Cooperation

---

**2006/SOM1/CPDG/010**

Agenda Item: 3

**Evaluation Report: CTI 07/2004T  
Second Phase of the APEC-OECD Co-operative  
Initiative on Regulatory Reform (2003-2004)**

Purpose: Information  
Submitted by: Mexico



**Competition Policy and Deregulation Group  
Ha Noi, Viet Nam  
24 February 2006**

**APEC PROJECT FORMAT**

**Evaluation Report on APEC Projects**

Operational Account       TILF Special Account       APEC Support Fund

<b>Project number:</b> CTI 07/2004T		Date received by Secretariat:
<b>Name of Committee/Working Group:</b> Committee on Trade & Investment / Competition Policy and Deregulation Group (CPDG)		
<b>Title of Project:</b> Second phase of the APEC-OECD Co-operative Initiative on Regulatory Reform (2003-2004).		
<b>Proposing APEC Economy:</b> Mexico		
Co-sponsoring APEC Economy (ies)		
Project Overseer: Name, Title and Organization		M
Ernesto Estrada Gonzalez (M) General Director of International Affairs Federal Competition Commission, MEXICO		
<b>Postal address:</b>  <b>Monte Libano 225 Lomas de Chapultepec México City 11000</b>		Tel: (52 55) 9140 0360 Fax: (52 55) 9140 0359 Email: <a href="mailto:eestrada@cfc.gob.mx">eestrada@cfc.gob.mx</a>
Financial Information	Total cost of proposal (US\$): 144,800	<b>Amount being sought from APEC Central Fund (US\$):</b> 171,800 Requested 144,800 Approved
Type of Project: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> seminar/symposium <input type="checkbox"/> short-term training course <input type="checkbox"/> survey or analysis and research <input type="checkbox"/> database/website <input type="checkbox"/> others ( <i>Please specify</i> )		
Project start date: September 2003		Project end date: November 2004
<b>Brief description of Project : its purpose and the principal activities (including when and where) :</b>  An APEC-OECD Agreement on joint work on regulatory reform was developed in the third quarter 2000 and was endorsed at the APEC Ministerial Meeting in 12-13 November 2000 in Brunei Darussalam. The Agreement set out the framework for the co-operative initiative for APEC and OECD, with the aim of supporting implementation of the principles on regulatory reform adopted by the member economies of the two organizations. On October 2002, APEC and OECD agreed at the International Conference on Regulatory Reform in Jeju Island, Korea, to pursue a Second Phase (2003-2004) of the APEC-OECD Co-operative Initiative, which is the project reported here.		

Mexico coordinated this Second Phase as convener of the CPDG. A central proposal for the Second Phase was to work collectively on the creation of an Integrated Checklist to help countries self-assess their progress in terms of implementing the common principles on regulatory reform. The goal is to foster as far as possible and feasible, and without compromising the policy objectives, a triple integration of regulatory practices: an integration of both sets of principles, of the main policy areas constituting regulatory reform and of governance perspectives. The APEC-OECD Co-operative Initiative would act as a catalyst in developing this new integrated tool by bringing together the expertise of member economies and relevant individuals and institutions.

The Second Phase of the APEC-OECD Co-operative Initiative consisted of a series of four events. The first workshop held in Vancouver, 8-9 October 2003, focused on regulatory quality, where participants discussed the framework, the horizontal aspects and the regulatory policy dimension of the Integrated Checklist. The second workshop held in Paris, 2-3 December 2003 focused on competition policy, where participants discussed the competition aspects. The third workshop held in Pucon, Chile, 24-25 May 2004, focused on market openness. In parallel, participants continued exchanging information on competition, good regulatory practices and concepts that contributed to understanding the necessary elements for the Checklist at each workshop. The final conference was held in Bangkok, 1 November 2004, and concluded the preparation of the Checklist by eliciting the comments and support of stakeholders. All these events have provided an opportunity to discuss a multidisciplinary instrument that can be put to practical use to implement APEC and OECD principles.

**Signature of Project Overseer:**

**(Separate written confirmation acceptable for email submission)**

**Date:**

**Signature of Committee Chair/WG Lead Shepherd:  
Progress Report and Evaluation Report)**

**(Not applicable to**

**(Separate written confirmation acceptable for email submission)**

**Date:**

## **APEC Project Evaluation Form**

### **Objectives**

1. Did you achieve your objectives and expected results? Did the project meet the needs of the targeted beneficiaries, identify direct and indirect beneficiaries? What was the quality of the product/service you provided?

The project was aimed at preparing an Integrated Checklist on Regulatory Reform. The integrated Checklist was aimed at promoting the individual and collective implementation of the APEC Principles to Enhance Competition and Regulatory Reform and the 1997 OECD Policy Recommendations on Regulatory Reform.

In order to reach the objective a series of four events were held in Vancouver, Paris, Pucon and Bangkok. Throughout these events participants exchanged information on competition, good regulatory practices that contributed to understanding the necessary elements for the Checklist. Furthermore, these events provided an opportunity to discuss a multidisciplinary instrument that can be put to practical use by implementing APEC and OECD principles. The final conference concluded the preparation of the Checklist and elicited the comments and support of stakeholders.

The Integrated Checklist translates the general statements found in the APEC and OECD principles into concrete, practical terms that can be applied in different context, and does so in ways that integrate governance perspectives: transparency, accountability and performance.

In addition to drawing directly from APEC and OECD Principles, the Integrated Checklist incorporates the results of previous discussions of past APEC-OECD events as well as recent material developed by these organizations.

Because of the complexity of the issues involved and the synergies and occasional trade-offs among competing objectives, the Integrated Checklist should provide clear guidance and explicit criteria to make evaluation easier, while helping create a framework in which priorities can be set, capacities enlarged, and awareness raised.

The Integrated Checklist is a unique and major effort for international development of good regulatory governance practices. The Integrated Checklist should also function as a repository of APEC and OECD members' experience, knowledge and best practices leading to further reforms.

Early indications are that one or more APEC Economies are willing to implement the Checklist.

In a changing world, government action remains essential to protect and promote important social objectives, such as safety, health, and environment quality, and the international community has taken commitments to several social and environmental agreements in the past decade. Indeed, as economies develop, public expectations in such areas tend to increase. More efficient and dynamic economies will help governments serve these public interests. Experience shows that reform, if properly carried out, should not adversely effect, and can often promote, such objectives. The Checklist is an integrated self-assessment tool. Given that it is made public, is likely to become a point of reference worldwide.

One of the objectives at the end of this phase was to obtain formal endorsement from APEC & OECD executive bodies of the final Checklist.

Also APEC Ministers Responsible for Trade (MRT's) formally endorsed the Integrated Checklist during their meeting in Jeju, Korea on June 2-3, 2005 as reflected in their statement to the chair.

The OECD's Council endorsed the Checklist on May 2005.

2. Show your actual results relative to quantitative measures you proposed in paragraph 1 (and 25) or the project design proposal and evaluate those results relative to your benchmarks and the ranges you indicated would be acceptable in the project design form.

Does not apply, although, as mentioned previously, one or more APEC economies have expressed a willingness to implement the Checklist.

3. Are there any lessons learned?

OECD and APEC principles point to the need for further regulatory reform but also basic elements and principles such as the importance of regulatory quality, competition and the avoidance of unnecessary economic distortions. They also share key core values such as transparency, non-discrimination, and accountability. Both aim at establishing a policy framework and developing capacities to create a regulatory environment conducive to a well-functioning market economy.

In sum, the two sets can be seen as mutually supportive and consistent and their integration should serve to strengthen their accessibility and implementation. Moreover, any guidelines on these matters will be most effective to the extent that they are seen as flexible and evolving and allow scope for improvement and refinement.

4. For Ecotech Projects Only – What impact has the project had in terms of advancing the Ecotech priorities contained in the Manila Framework for Strengthening Economic Cooperation and Development?
5. Did the project achieve any of the priorities of the Framework for the Integration of Women in APEC?
  - Questions that may be relevant are: Were women consulted on the project? Did the project take into account the potentially different needs of women and men? Was the training inclusive and relevant to women's experiences? Was child care available?

Women were kindly involved in the organization and execution of the events of the project. The events were offered to all participants irrespective of gender. Child care was not available and was not requested by any of the participants in the workshops.

6. Provide a brief description of the outputs of the project to show the effects on women.
  - Questions that may be relevant are: Was the training for a sector/occupation of the labour market where there is a large proportion of women workers (eg, nursing)? Did the project provide services that assisted many women (eg, health or education)? Did the workshop raise women's confidence or encourage women to seek further training or employment?

Female participation was important during the planning and organization of this project, and female speakers were present throughout the project.

### ***Linkages***

7. Describe how your project involved business/private sector participation (e.g. co-sponsorship of an event, joint work on a project etc.) and which types of business/private sector institutions participated (e.g. non-governmental organizations, schools, labor organizations, womens' groups, corporations, small businesses etc.)

The project was the second phase of the APEC-OECD Co-operative Initiative. Therefore, the project was developed with joint work of both organizations.

Participants in all events of the project were officials from the APEC and OECD economies and

Secretariats, invited experts from other international organizations, and invited representatives of the private sector, trade unions, consumer organizations and academia.

8. Which other APEC fora (if any) participated in your project? How did you coordinate your work with the work of other APEC fora? How did the project complement or overlap with the work of others?

The project was developed with joint work of APEC and OECD, in particular, the Competition Policy and Deregulation Group of APEC and the Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate of the OECD. Issues discussed during these meetings are relevant to other APEC for a such as SELI and the Economic Committee, who is now overseeing the third phase of the initiative.

### ***Methodology and Budget***

9. Was the project completed on schedule? Yes  
Was the project completed on budget? Yes

10. Describe any problems which arose and how they were resolved, including changes in schedule or revised dates, budget changes, changes in participation, or additions or deletions of activities.

None arose.

11. What kind of sex-disaggregated data was collected at the beginning, end and during the project, and what did it show? See examples on last page of this Form.

NA

12. If sex-disaggregated data was not used, indicate why (eg, lack of availability or relevance). Was there any sex-disaggregated data that would have been useful but was not available?

Disaggregated by sex was not relevant to the project.

13. Provide sex-disaggregated data on the beneficiaries of the project.

NA

14. Provide details of the project's budget that was allocated to activities that address the specific needs of women, where appropriate.

NA

15. Provide details of how the project could have further increased women's involvement or ensured that men and women benefited more equitably?

NA

### ***Dissemination of Project Output***

16. Describe your deliverables and how they have been disseminated. How have you communicated the results of this project (presentations, newsletters, seminars, journal articles, Web page, video, etc)?

Proceedings of the four workshop of the project were circulated to all participants. These proceedings included a summary of presentations, as well as all submitted papers for each event.

The Integrated Checklist was also circulated to all and is available in APEC and OECD web pages.

APEC MRT's also issued an endorsement for the list, which was made public.

17. What additional actions should be taken to disseminate project results and maximize project impact over the longer term? If relevant, is there any action that the project beneficiary/ies should take to continue improving performance relative to the quantitative measures in paragraph 3 (and 22) of the project design form?

Implementation of the Checklist is one of the key actions that can be taken both to disseminate and maximize its long run impact. This is some of the work currently undertaken in the third phase of the APEC-OECD Regulatory Reform Initiative.

### ***Comments***

18. Forum small group:

19. Lead Shepherds/Chairs

20. Secretariat

\* \* \* \* \*

**Examples for the Use and Collection  
of Sex-disaggregated Data and Information**

**Development of mathematics curriculum**

The following questions could be asked at the beginning and during the project:

1. Is data available on male and female students participation in mathematics?
2. Is information available on the different learning needs of males and females?
3. How many women will be involved in developing the curriculum?
4. How will this data be used in the planning and delivery phase of this project?

**Community development project**

The following questions could be asked at the beginning and during the project:

1. How many men and women will be employed in the project?
2. Is the project in an industry that has a large concentration of male or female workers?
3. Do the men or women participants require child care facilities?
4. Can this data be used in the planning phase of this project? (eg, If there are only a few women, what could be done to increase their participation?)

**Workshop/training**

The following questions could be asked throughout the project:

1. What were the number, sex and type of participants at the workshop?

<i>Government</i>		<i>Private sector/business</i>	
<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>

2. What is the number and sex of project managers?
3. What was the number and sex of speakers/panelists at the workshop?
4. What is the number, sex and type of participants who completed the workshop?

\* \* \* \* \*