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Secretary General

DRAFT Summary record of the 9th apt policy and regulation forum for pacific (PRFP-9)

1. Introduction

The 9th APT Policy and Regulation Forum for Pacific (PRFP-9) was held from 28 to 30 June 2016 in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea. The meeting was organized by the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity (APT). The Forum was hosted by the National Information and Communications Technology Authority (NICTA), Papua New Guinea, and supported by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC), Government of Japan, and Department of Communications and the Arts, Australian Government.

The agenda and the programme of the meeting are contained in Documents PRFP-9/ADM-01 and PRFP-9/ADM-02 (Rev.7) respectively.

The Meeting was attended by 87 participants representing Members, Associate Members, Affiliate Members, International/Regional Organizations, other organizations and APT Secretariat. Document PRFP-9/ADM-03 contains the list of participants of the meeting.

1. Opening Session (Tuesday, 28 June 2016, 9:30-10:00)
   1. Welcome Address by Ms. Areewan Haorangsi, Secretary General, Asia-Pacific Telecommunity *(Document PRFP-9/INP-01)*

Ms. Areewan Haorangsi, Secretary General of APT delivered the Welcome Address.

The full text of Ms. Areewan’s Welcome Address can be found in document PRFP-9/INP-01.

* 1. Inaugural Address by Honourable Jimmy Miringtoro, Minister for Communication and Information Technology *(Document PRFP-9/INP-02)*

Honourable Jimmy Miringtoro, Minister for Communication and Information Technology delivered the Inaugural Address.

The full text of Honourable Jimmy Miringtoro can be found in document PRFP-9/INP-02.

* 1. Presentation of a token of appreciation by APT

A token of appreciation was presented to the Honourable Minister by the Secretary General of the APT.

* 1. Presentation of a token of appreciation by NICTA

A token of appreciation was presented to the Secretary General of the APT by the Honourable Minister.

1. Session 1: Policy and Regulation Trends in the Pacific (Tuesday, 28 June 2016, 10:30-12:15)

**Chair**: Mr. Charles Punaha, Chairman of PRFP

* 1. Adoption of Agenda (*Document PRFP-9/ADM-01*)

The Chairman introduced the provisional agenda of the meeting contained in document PRFP-9/ADM-01. The meeting adopted the agenda as proposed.

|  |
| --- |
| Decision No. 1 (PRFP-9) |
| The meeting adopted the agenda of PRFP-9 meeting as proposed in document PRFP-9/ADM-01. |

* 1. The Outcomes of the 39th Session of the MC and Implementation Status of the Strategic Plan of the APT 2015-2017 *(Document PRFP-9/INP-03 & INP-04)*

Ms. Areewan Haorangsi, Secretary General of APT, presented the combined presentation on the outcomes of the 39th Session of the Management Committee of the APT (document PRFP-9/INP-03), and Implementation Status of the Strategic Plan of the APT 2015-2017 (document PRFP-9/INP-04). She highlighted the key decisions and instructions from the MC-39 to all APT Work Programmes. The presentation stressed the MC instruction on the responsibility of Chairman to review the report of the concerning Work Programme before its adoption, and to attend the APT Management Committee to represent the concerning Work Programme. MC-39 also instructed all Work Programmes to develop tangible outcomes, and to consider the elements relevant to PRFP that are necessary to be included in the draft Strategic Plan for 2018 – 2020. She highlighted the implementation status of the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2015-2017 activities that were relevant to PRFP. She also asked the Members to suggest the activities that could be added in the report to MC this year regarding the current Strategic Plan.

|  |
| --- |
| Decision no. 2 (PRFP-9) |
| The meeting noted the outcomes of the 39th Session of the MC and Implementation Status of the Strategic Plan of the APT2015-2017. |

* 1. Liberalization of Telecommunication market (Case of Solomon Islands) *(Document PRFP-9/INP-06)*

Mr. Alwyn Danitofea, Director Communication, Ministry of Communication and Aviation, Solomon Islands introduced a brief history of Solomon Islands telecommunication. He then talked about the situation after liberalization of the telecommunication market where the telecommunication regulator was established and there was a new mobile operator. Mobile penetration and coverage increased significantly while fixed line connections were stable. Government planned to develop a National Broadcasting policy and National ICT policy.

* 1. MVNO Policy and Trends in Japan *(Document PRFP-9/INP-07)*

Mr. Sho Yamauchi, Assistant Director, MIC Japan, explained about the Mobile market in Japan which was under an oligopoly condition by three operators. Then he explained about Japan’s policy to facilitate MVNOs to promote competition. MVNOs have provided more affordable prices and become popular. The number of MVNO users was still growing. Cat.2 Regulation (for mobile) is the core of the Japanese MVNO policy. A Full-MVNO is an MVNO which has its own HLR/HSS. Currently there is no full-MVNO in Japan.

* 1. Open Discussion and Q&A

A delegate from Samoa commented on the implementation matrix of Strategic Plan of the APT on work item 2 for ICT development and would like to see a capacity forum in term of formal courses offered at the University of South Pacific. For the Pacific Island countries it will be much easier and much cheaper for Pacific Island Governments to build capacity of the experts from different jurisdictions. She also commented to Mr. Danitofea from Solomon Islands that it was good to see that the mobile coverage was increasing and she asked if there were any impacts on the tariff, the actual cost of service that will be borne by the consumer.

Secretary General responded that the matrix was to show the update of the implementation. If Members would like to add more implementation status or activity in the matrix, APT Secretariat would take note of the comment.

Mr. Danitofea queried the Regulator from Solomon Island to answer Samoa’s question regarding telecommunication status, then the Regulator answered that there has been a great impact with coverage as well as penetration, there were a lot more users accessing service. This meant that the service was affordable and reflect the impact of the tariff.

Dr. Horton commented that MVNO might be thing of the future of Pacific Islands and there is no reason why can’t we leapfrog to the future and introduce MVNO if it brings down price on the market. He then asked Mr. Yamauchi what would happen when MVNOs grow and have significant market power.

Mr. Yamauchi answered that they can be an important market player and we may wish to concern about regulation of MVNO, we must regulate them if they have more market power someday.

Dr. Horton commented to Mr. Danitofea that a cable to Sydney will be good and asked if they are looking at other technologies.

Mr. Danitofea answered that it is not economically feasible to have a connection to all islands but some important islands will be connected by evaluating how those islands contribute to economy of the Solomon Islands.

Mr. Lipton from PiRRC asked Mr. Yamauchi that regarding the policy on MVNO, does it take into account the capital investment that MNO has done.

Mr. Yamauchi responded that retail price for customers from MNO’s is too expensive and the first priority is to reduce the retail price.

1. Session 2: International Connectivity for the Pacific Islands (Tuesday, 28 June 2016, 14:00-15:30)

**Chair**: Ms. Dalsie Baniala, Regulator, Vanuatu

* 1. Satellite and Submarine International Connectivity in the Pacific *(Document PRFP-9/INP-08)*

Mr. Wisit Atipayakoon, Programme Officer, ITU and Mr. Maui Sanford, ITU Consultant, presented the document. The presentation introduced the Final Acts of the WCIT-12 (Dubai, 2012) which resolved to instruct the Director of the ITU-D to study the special situation of telecommunication/ICT services in LLDCs and SIDS and to assist LLDCs and SIDS to develop their required plans. ITU is preparing to commence the study in conjunction with its Pacific regional project on Satellite Connectivity which intends to establish rural internet community centres utilizing VSAT systems in the Pacific membership countries.

* 1. Opportunities for Key Efficiencies across the Pacific Islands and the Implications for Policy Makers and Regulators *(Document PRFP-9/INP-09)*

Mr. Kenneth Teo, Director Solution Marketing, Huawei, Singapore, provided an example of Singapore on how it achieved good international connectivity. He then talked about how Landline service providers across the Pacific could potentially benefit from a common approach to the provision of services within their individual markets. This common approach could include procurement, services, operations and innovation. Finally it discussed the implications of this approach for policy makers and regulators.

* 1. NTN Vision-Building a National Transmission Network with International Options *(Document PRFP-9/INP-10)*

Mr. Une O’ome, GM-Commercial Services, DataCo, presented the document talking about the company established in 2014 to provide transmission services across provinces and manage the international connectivity into PNG. Dataco is to build domestic cables and to be a wholesale operator who does not play in the retail market. Dataco has 2 international submarine cables that land in PNG. He highlighted an issue of low utilization due to the difficulty to connect traffic from other cities to the cable landing points, and its vision to be internet hub of the Pacific by having 4 international cables to North, East, West, and South.

* 1. Open Discussion and Q&A

Dr. Horton asked ITU whether it used least cost routing, then Mr. Sanford answered that the routing can be problematic and depends on many factors.

Nauru asked ITU about the OPEX between cable and satellite, and then Mr. Sanford answered that submarine cable is like a road which doesn’t care for how many cars use the road while satellite is charging per car.

1. Session 3: Issues in Reducing Mobile Roaming Charges in the Pacific (Tuesday, 28 June 2016, 15:45-17:15)

**Chair**: Dr. Bob Horton, Board Member of NICTA Board

* 1. Australia’s Approach to International Mobile Roaming (*Document PRFP-9/INP-11*)

Mr. Joseph McCarroll, Senior Policy Officer, Department of Communication and the Arts, Australia, introduced an issue about IMR. Transparent and reasonable rates for IMR services can help promote trade and enhance consumer welfare. ACMA “critical information summary” requirement ensures consumers have clear information about IMR rates. DOCA monitors IMR pricing to establish trends. OTT services can substitute IMR to some extent. The Australian Government does not regulate the IMR rate, and has not engaged in any IMR bilateral regulatory arrangement. It encourage cooperation to promote transparent and reasonable rates.

* 1. International Mobile Roaming Regulation and the Pacific *(Document PRFP-9/INP-12)*

Mr. Wisit Atipayakoon, Programme Officer, ITU, and Mr. Scott Minehane, ITU Consultant, presented the document introduced the principles of international mobile roaming charges, summarised global and regional practices, explored the current circumstances in the Pacific including issues and challenges for the region, outlined possible options/approaches for optimise consumer benefits and made a call for input and suggested approaches from industry as part of the ITU study. The ITU has developed an IMR Resources portal to provide information about activities done in national and international level.

* 1. APT International Mobile Roaming Working Group Report *(Document PRFP-9/INP-13)*

Mr. Stuart Davies, Telecom Consultant, APT, presented the APT IMR WG which was instigated by DOC, Australia. Its objective was to put forward recommendations to APT on the ways to address the issue of high IMR prices. From the 3 meetings, the last meeting produced the IMR Report. Since the IMR WG Report is now quite dated and it did not fully consider data roaming, it is timely for the Report to be reviewed. Also new services such as OTT, M2M and IoT need to be deliberated.

* 1. Open Discussion and Q&A

Dr. Horton raised the question on what you can do to help, what we can do on the regional basis and what is the tangible outcomes that we can offer.

Mr. McCarroll answered that consumer awareness is the key part. The benefit is that it doesn’t require any bilateral agreement. It can deliver tangible benefits to consumer. Mr. Atipayakoon mentioned that ITU is studying on it and welcome comments then he asked participants to send comments to ITU.

Dr. Horton suggested to have a complete package of advice or guideline on IMR for the next PRFP. Mr. Sanford added that tourism is the key and 25% of net margin comes from roaming. It helps to subsidize infrastructure development.

Mr. Craig Price asked about SIM registration that should a person be allowed to roam if not registered in his country. Mr. Davies answered that there is an established process for authentication.

Samoa asked a general question, such as how policy makers and regulators should perceive the future. Mr. Minehane replied that technology developments that are available globally are available in Pacific. For regulation, there are a lot of challenges such as, Fintech, taxation policy, privacy, security. He encouraged every regulator has to think about these questions.

Mr. Punaha commented that roaming has been discussed earlier and there was no a way we could come to resolve or agree on the way forward. Some countries use IMR as a source of revenue. Now OTT will also be difficult to come to a resolution. There are only two possible ways, the first is government to government agreement, such as between Australia and New Zealand. Could it be then extended to Pacific countries? The second is how we roam with one operator in different country.

There were more discussions on SIM registration and authentication, and roaming taxation issues.

1. Session 4: Cybersecurity and Internet Policy Issues (Wednesday, 29 June 2016, 9:00-10:30)

**Chair**: Mr. Joseph McCarroll, Senior Policy Officer, Department of Communication and Arts, Australia

* 1. APCERT and Cyber security in the Asia Pacific – Challenges, Collaboration and Capacity Building *(Document PRFP-9/INP-14)*

Dr. Ewan Ward, Chair, APCERT, talked about the Asia Pacific CERT (APCERT) which is a forum for regional collaboration among CERTs and CSIRTs from across the Asia Pacific region. The presentation provided an overview of APCERT, its membership, structure and activities, and the importance of regional (and global) collaboration to overcome the challenges of cyber security.

* 1. Who is that? Addressing the Asia Pacific *(Document PRFP-9/INP-15)*

Mr. Adam Gosling, Internet Policy Development Consultant, Asia Pacific Network Information Center (APNIC), made an introduction of APNIC which is the regional Internet number Registry for the APAC. APNIC maintains a public record of IP address delegations called the APNIC Whois Database. The registry is an important resource for network operators, security teams, and Law Enforcement Agencies. The policies and procedures that govern the Whois database are currently under review in an effort to improve the data quality.

* 1. DNS Security (*Document PRFP-9/INP-16*)

Mr. Champika Wijayatunga, Security Stability and Resilience Engagement Manager-APAC, ICANN, presented the document describing about the Domain Name System (DNS) and its functions, challenges and different types of security threats that can be involved. The presentation highlighted the importance of DNS Security and the mechanisms to protect DNS infrastructures. To counter these threats, DNSSEC uses a digital signature to verify the data. Public and Private keys are used. DNSSEC is now required by the new ICANN Registrar agreement.

* 1. Open Discussion and Q&A

Papua New Guinea asked Dr. Ward to provide any real threat to Members, then Dr. Ward gave an example of Rocky ransomware.

Mr. Punaha commented that APCERT is good for some countries who try to establish national CERT. He further questioned on the collaboration between APCERT and PACCERT. Papua New Guinea indicated they will come to APCERT when it sets up its own CERT at later stage. Dr. Ward replied that PACCERT was not able to be sustained. Also he mentioned that it may not practical for each economy to have its own CERT.

1. Session 5: Emergency Communications and ICT for Disaster Risk Reduction (Wednesday, 29 June 2016, 10:45-12:15)

**Chair**: Mr. Moses Virivolomo, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Communication and Aviation, Solomon Islands

* 1. Emergency Broadcasting in PNG *(Document PRFP-9/INP-18)*

Mr. Ian Mannix, Manager Emergency Broadcasting, Australian Broadcasting Corporation, presented about the Emergency Broadcasting which, is a new concept that has been shown in Australia to save lives, build resilience; broaden community support for emergency agencies and the media and it provides a powerful, effective warning system. He then highlighted the implementation in PNG, where the Emergency Broadcaster is NBC PNG and it has different levels of Radio emergency alert. NBC has a disaster & emergency broadcast policy for effective management and dissemination of information before and in times of Disasters and Emergencies.

* 1. Emergency Communications and ICT for Disaster Risk Reduction: the Emergency Telecommunication Cluster *(Document PRFP-9/INP-19)*

Mr. Enrico Vigliani, Regional IT Officer for Asia-Pacific, World Food Programme, presented the document via remote presentation introducing the Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (ETC) which is a global network of organizations that work together to provide shared communication services in humanitarian emergencies. Clusters are groups of humanitarian organizations working in the main sectors of humanitarian action. WFP is global lead of the ETC. Within 48 hours of a disaster, the ETC provides basic security communications services, shared internet connectivity from a central location, shared voice communications services. ETC services are expanded & enhanced in the four weeks following a disaster.

* 1. Output of APT WDMC-7 (Document PRFP-9/INP-17)

Mr. Pubate Satienpoch, Project Coordinator (Policy & Regulation), APT, explained about the WDMC-7 workshop arranged in Bangkok this April. He highlighted the topics covered in the workshop and some key points discussed from each session. He also talked about the discussion at the end of the workshop where Members discussed about suggested topics to be included in the new Strategic Plan of the APT including Equipment/Spectrum clearance during post disaster, civil aviation to cross borders, and common spectrum in C, Ku, and other bands for disaster recovery would be useful. Members should carry out prevention evaluation to assess whether they are prepared or not, and to have standard preparedness procedures.

* 1. Open Discussion and Q&A

Dr. Horton asked Mr. Satienpoch about the Equipment/Spectrum clearance and asked whether APT has created any document on the issue. Mr. Satienpoch replied that the topic about Equipment/Spectrum clearance was a proposal from the meeting to be included in the new Strategic Plan of the APT.

1. Session 6: Policy and Regulation of Over-The-Top (OTT) (Wednesday, 29 June 2016, 14:00-15:30)

**Chair**: Mr. Shivnesh Prasad, Vice Chairman, PRFP

* 1. Next Generation Telecommunications – Is there a role for Regulators? *(Document PRFP-9/INP-20)*

Mr. Craig Price, SVP International Projects, PCCW Global, explained about Telecommunications seeking to become next generation service providers driven by disintermediation of services. Disintermediation means to remove the middle man and it is the word that regulators should know. The old customer experience and the business model supporting it is rapidly becoming obsolete. New services such as OTT voice and data are driving telecommunication companies to seek new delivery models such as “event” based services. Finally he summarized about the role for Regulator in various aspects.

* 1. OTTs: To regulate or not regulate, what is the policy? *(Document PRFP-9/INP-21)*

Mr. Donnie Defreitas, Project Director and Mr. Marc Lipton, Director of Research, PiRRC, presented the document. The presentation raised an issue that the question is not whether we regulate or not, but the questions is can we regulate. Industry moved from voice intensive to data intensive traffic, especially for video which make the traffic asymmetric and blocks the network capacity for other users. Then it covered issues that need to be considered from Regulatory, Ministry/Policy, and Industry/Service providers.

* 1. Keeping the Internet open to Innovation (Document PRFP-9/INP-22)

Ms. Noelle de Guzman, Regional Programmes Coordinator, ISOC, talked about the definition of OTT and how MNOs adapted themselves such as forming partnership with OTT player. She then discussed about the regulations for OTT in APAC countries including Pakistan, Indonesia, and South Korea. The presentation also covered aspects in considering regulation which should be weighted between possible risks and benefits that it would have to consumer.

1. Session 7: Closed Regulator’s Session (Wednesday, 29 June 2016, 15:45-17:30)

**Facilitator**: Mr. Stuart Davies, Telecom Consultant, APT

The APT Secretariat requested Members to submit topics for discussion prior to PRFP-9. A total of 11 topics were submitted from 7 different countries (note some topics were nominated by more than one Member). The topics submitted included:

* Spectrum Management;
* Legislation;
* Regulation of OTT;
* Implementation of Digital TV;
* Mechanism for implementation of Universal Access Funds;
* Regulation of Submarine Cable Market;
* Emergency Telecommunications;
* Digital Financial Inclusion;
* Number Management System;
* Climate change; and,
* APT APG Meeting.

Detailed discussion took place between the Regulators on each of the topics except Climate Change which was withdrawn.

1. Session 8: Business Dialogue: Competitiveness of the Telecommunications Market (THURSday, 30 June 2016, 9:00-10:30)

**Chair**: Mr. Kila Gulo-Vui, Director, Economics, Consumer & International Affairs, NICTA, PNG

* 1. ICT Opportunities and Challenges for Regulators and Policy Makers *(Document PRFP-9/INP-23)*

Mr. John Vidler, Director Solutions, Huawei, Australia, presented the document. He explained how new ICT technology development transformed the Telecommunications Market worldwide and including the Pacific. A Digital Service Provider Model gets revenues from wholesale to upstream customers (service providers) and from retail to downstream customers (end users). The Cloud and Big Data are driving and being driven by Business Change. The presentation finally talked about implication these changes have for policy makers and regulators in Pacific.

* 1. PNG’s Competitiveness in Telecommunications Market *(Document PRFP-9/INP-24)*

Mr. Michael Donnelly, CEO, Telkom PNG, shared his observation based around his nearly 30 years working experiences. The observation was that the market often doesn’t work with a lack of contestability of products and services. There was lack of policy clarifications from government and lack of enforcing power from regulators, duplication in capital investments and no systematic investment in skill and knowledge transfer. Some statistics about the telecommunication market share in PNG in 2005 and 2014 were presented. Voice and Internet penetration in PNG was still low despite the amount of investment. This was the evidence that the market was not functioning. The normal norm of using price to grow the market was not effective. .

* 1. Investing for Growth (Document PRFP-9/INP-25)

Mr. Michael Murphy, CEO, Digicel Pacific, presented the document. He talked about the liberalization of the market in Samoa and its result. Ongoing investment is the key driver of success in the Pacific. He then explained about four key challenges that need to be dealt with which are updating of the regulatory framework, ensuring regulation reflects local circumstances, ensuring regulation doesn’t undermine existing infrastructure, and addressing international connectivity issues. To move forward, Governments, Regulators, and Private Investors need to work together to be able to maintain competitor’s pressure on consumer pricing but also encouraging telecommunication companies to keep investing in the country.

* 1. Open Discussion and Q&A

Mr. Punaha commented to Mr. Murphy regarding OTT service provider and he mentioned that the presentation in the day before had broaden their minds and lead to more confusion as whether or not regulators should regulate OTT services. Digicel view was anti-competitive in that people were cherry picking on their investment, free riding on the network, and the company was losing revenue. It might result in the decision of Digicel not to invest in the infrastructure in ICT sector. At the same time OTT service providers, unlike the operators, were not subject to any conditions. On the other hand it need to respect the fact that at the end of the day, it’s the consumers who decide whether they need to access to OTT services. He then asked what are expected for Regulator and policy maker to address the issue.

Mr. Vidler replied that from the vendor and its customer point of view, there were a number of different scenarios that need to take place with respect to OTT competition happening in the market. In most markets, it’s a balancing act between the need for competition with the market against the regulation for consumers and enterprise operation in that market. He further commented that there were other issues that need to be tackled in term of encouraging more traditional competition in conjunction with low cost bandwidth that will drive OTT competition in the future.

Mr. Murphy advised that the key thing was that we cannot stop the growth of OTT and it’s a consumer choice. The biggest OTT player was Facebook, and Digicel offered it for free with a social plan. Digicel was actually embraced by OTT since it would be difficult to regulate OTT where its point of presence was not in the country. Consumers want to have all the choices and he reminded other regulators have to give consumers choices. Ultimately speaking when the equipment becomes a lot cheaper, then investment will become easier. He further urged to get into more dialogue around that. Ultimately it’s the consumer choice. He gave one example with Brisbane UBER which could be a new monopoly in 5 years and this new service affected traditional taxi drivers. This is worldwide issue across all regulated bodies, from taxi driver to media to telecom.

Mr. Donnelly replied that we have to be careful for vendor driven enabler. It costs a lot to have underline technology to enable these OTT applications. Operators were often referred to as carriers by vendors, which was a bit confusing. They run retail applications and services on their infrastructure, but they also built infrastructure. So they need to make return on investment on both layers, not only one layer. There were a lot of money being spent in infrastructure but it’s not translating into uptake of the services. Applications on the Internet is the creative destruction medium which destroyed their business model, but we cannot stop that. This can be seen from example from newspaper business, taxi business, and many other industries. We can’t stop those innovative business models, but unless we have reliable well-maintained infrastructure and contestability at those points of presence. He also commented that we will not get the innovation whether OTT services or new business models which will drive not just application or consumer behavior, but will drive economic growth.

A delegate from PNG made a comment that market dynamics is a function of not only affordability but of literacy too. Literacy allows people to use devices. He asked panelists about their experience they have as carriers in relation to literacy and what the dynamic ranges in term of age, and he asked Digicel on their experience on the issue of cross subsidy where the operation in one place which is very high cost, is carried by operation in another place which make profit.

Mr. Murphy replied that anyone who want to have national footprint in PNG has cross subsidization. Digicel believes that overall model make sense for them to grow broadband penetration, and they have to invest in the whole country. They believe in long term that people will adopt to using phones. Regarding the question on OTT usage and population, the big adoption of OTT around the world was about 15- 16 age group initially, then their behavior change to use different platforms when they are different ages such as using Facebook when they are 20 and LinkedIn when they are 30.

1. Session 9: Regional Cooperation and shared infrastructure in the Pacific (THURsday, 30 June 2016, 10:45-12:15)

**Chair**: Ms. Unutoa Fonoti, Regulator, Office of the Regulator, Samoa

* 1. Harmonised Use, Free Circulation and Exemption from Individual Licensing of Earth Stations in Motion (ESIMs) Transmitting in the 29.5-30.0 GHz Band in the Pacific Sub-Region *(Document PRFP-9/INP-26)*

Ms. Laura Roberti, Director Market Access, INMARSAT, presented the document. She gave an introduction about the ESIM and elaborated on the potential benefits and a model for a harmonized class licensing framework and free circulation of ESIMs, based on mutual recognition of licenses in the Pacific sub-region in order to allow governments and private sector alike to benefit from the possibilities and timeliness offered by technology. A few proposals were suggested to PRFP-9 to give further consideration to a mutually agreed framework for a Pacific agreement related to the harmonization of approaches to authorization, a system of mutual recognition of pre-registered terminals and equipment which meets internationally approved standards, and a system of registration on behalf of participating Pacific Islands.

* 1. Regional Cooperation and Shared Infrastructure in the Pacific – Challenges & Opportunities *(Document PRFP-9/INP-27)*

Mr. Kila Gulo-Vui, Director, Economics, Consumer & International Affairs, NICTA, PNG, presented the document. The presentation reviewed the current situation in the Pacific which is characterized by a fragmentation of activities for ICT development. Policy, regulations and standards need to be harmonized, and there’s need for large initial investments in ICT for international connectivity. He then explained possible regional cooperation and shared infrastructure, lesson learnt, key challenges, and opportunities for cooperation.

* 1. Enabling Digital Transformation in the Pacific (Document PRFP-9/INP-28)

Ms. Natasha Beschorner, Senior ICT Policy Specialist, World Bank, presented the document via remote presentation. The presentation outlined the potential of improved connectivity for enabling digital economy and digital government. It highlights some of the findings of the recent World Development Report—Digital Dividends. It also includes some examples of ICT- enabled development projects, and describes different forms of World Bank Group support, including information resources.

* 1. Open Discussion and Q&A

Mr. Punaha made some observations and comments on Ms. Roberti and Mr. Gulo-Vui presentations. Within the framework as outlined by Mr. Gulo-Vui on the existing agreement that Pacific leaders had agreed on initially in 2010 in Tonga, the presentation from Ms. Roberti made a lot of sense and this can be one of the first initiative that they would like to see in terms of collaboration and harmonization within the island states. They need to take into account the constraints that they faced in term of financial resources, human capacity, policy and regulatory aspects in different island states, including various stages of development. Taking into account the consideration, the proposal from Ms. Roberti made a lot of sense. Through APECTEL, PNG had mutual recognition arrangement between APEC member countries where radio equipment and apparatus approved in the member countries administration provided that they gave the certificate of approval then NICTA would just approve it. It would be high cost to do type approval by themselves. In term of licensing of terminal, NICTA currently license only the ground segment and they had blanket licensing framework. For the space segment, NICTA view was that this has already gone through coordination process through ITU by other administrations so they don’t do any licensing of the space segment. Within the framework on regional harmonization, if one country issues a license, it’s encouraged that that license would be recognized by member administrations of the Pacific. This is to facilitate inter islands shipping and inter islands aviation. Taking note of presentations from Ms. Roberti and Mr. Gulo-Vui, he then suggested that the meeting should agree to pursue this further and come out with some kind of MOA and for the next Ministerial conference, they can put it to the Ministers and sign an agreement incorporating this to facilitate for harmonized licensing agreement within the region.

Ms. Roberti mentioned that this idea went along the same line of principle of harmonization of regulation across the region. This proposal was not only for this region but also other region such as Africa, America. It has been implemented in Europe for some years now and it worked so well and simplified the work of Regulators and facilitated deployment of service in the past few years.

1. Session 10: Future Outlook- Panel Discussion (THURsday, 30 June 2016, 14:00-15:30)

**Moderator**: Mr. Stuart Davies, Telecom Consultant, APT

Panelists:

* Mr. Charles Punaha, CEO, NICTA
* Mr. Shivnesh Prasad, Vice Chairman, PRFP
* Ms. Unutoa Fonoti, Regulator, Office of the Regulator, Samoa
* Ms. Neilan Kaminaga, Director Communications, Marshall Islands.

Panelists general comment was that PRFP-9 was a very important Forum where members of the Pacific were able to freely discussion the unique issues of the Pacific Island countries. It was noted that OTT was a major topic for the Pacific.

Neilan Kaminaga, Marshall Islands, commented that his country is willing to share ideas with other countries of Pacific through PRFP on OTT, Competition in Pacific are important issues.

Wayne Reiher, Kiribati, commented on future PRFP should include Climate Change and Connectivity. He also reiterate the importance of PRFP and said he learnt a lot from this PRFP-9.

Criden Appi, Nauru, said the PRFP was very important for the Pacific region. Regarding funding he suggested back to back meetings with other organisations.

Bob Horton, NICTA, PNG, suggested the possibility of biannual meetings and the need for a PRFP Strategic Action Plan. He also suggested more involvement from the industry, especially concerning what they (industry) find frustrating. Mr. Punaha, NICTA, PNG, advised that it was not practical to have biannual meetings.

Dalsie Baniala, Vanuatu, thought that future PRFP should consider Net Neutrality, and Asela Peneueta, Tuvalu, thought PRFP was excellent for knowledge sharing and also commented on the need for Climate Change information. Lutoviko Falemaka, Tonga, noted that important issues for the future include OTT, Training and Digital Integration. Richard Pokoina, Cook Islands, priorities were Spectrum Management and Cybersecurity. He also commented on how productive the PRFP-9 was. Dimitry Viliamu, Niue, felt that training and capacity building were important and that he learnt a lot from PRFP-9. Donnie DeFreitas, PiRRC, comments included the need for greater cooperation between organisations, Dispute settlements and the need for annual meetings.

Joseph McCarroll, Australia, advised that Australia strongly supported PRFP.

1. Session 11: The Way Forward (THURsday, 30 June 2016, 15:45-17:00)

**Chair**: Mr. Charles Punaha, Chairman, PRFP

* 1. Changes to Working Methods *(Document PRFP-9/TMP-01)*

APT Secretariat presented the changed text of the Working Methods from MC-39 that included the responsibility of Chairman to review the report of the PRFP Work Programme to the MC before its adoption, and to attend the APT Management Committee to represent the PRFP.

Chairman asked for comments from the floor. There was no comment. The meeting approved the revised Working Methods as contained in Document PRFP-9/TMP-01.

|  |
| --- |
| Decision no. 3 (PRPF-9) |
| The meeting adopted the Working Methods of PRFP as proposed in Document PRFP-9/TMP-01. |

* 1. Update of Issues for Implementation for 2015-2017 and Consideration of Issues to be included to New Strategic Plan for 2018-2020.

Ms. Areewan Haorangsi, Secretary General of the APT, advised that she had given a presentation about the implementation status of the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2015-2017 on the first day of the meeting. The current Strategic Plan was also provided as an information document PRFP-9/INF-02. She asked the floor to forward any updates of issues regarding the implementation status of the 2015-2017 APT Strategic Plan to the APT Secretariat for them be included in the report to the 40th Session of the Management Committee.

She also mentioned the instruction from MC-39 for PRFP to consider the relevant elements that are necessary to be included in the draft Strategic Plan for 2018 – 2020. APT Secretariat would draft a new Strategic Plan for 2018-2020. She asked Members to consider the issues and provide the information to the APT Secretariat to have them included in the draft new Strategic Plan.

There were no input from the meeting.

* 1. Appointment of Chairman and Vice Chairmen

Chairman invited the Secretary General to inform the meeting about the appointment of the PRFP Chairman and Vice Chairmen.

Secretary General informed that the Head of Delegation meeting has re-elected Mr. Charles Punaha as a Chairman of PRFP and Mr. Shivnesh Prasad as a Vice Chairman of PRFP. Also Ms. Unutoa Fonoti from Samoa has been elected as a second Vice Chairman.

|  |
| --- |
| Decision no. 4 (PRFP-9) |
| The meeting elected Mr. Charles Punaha as a Chairman of PRFP, and Mr. Shivnesh Prasad from Fiji and Ms. Unutoa Fonoti from Samoa as Vice Chairmen of PRFP. |

* 1. Topics for the next PRFP

Chairman invited suggestions from participants on topics for the PRFP-9. There were no suggestion.

* 1. Date and Venue of PRFP-10

Chairman invited PRFP Members to consider the hosting of PRFP-10 which would be held in 2017. There was no offer. Chairman asked Fiji to consider to host the PRFP-10. Fiji accepted to propose hosting PRFP-10 to the Fiji administration.

|  |
| --- |
| Decision no. 5 (PRFP-9) |
| The meeting noted for Fiji to propose to the Fiji administration to host the next PRFP |

* 1. Output Documents

Chairman presented a proposed way forward to implement Pacific Regional ICT Strategic Plan (PRISAP) 2015 -2020 and Framework for Action ICT for Development in the Region (FAIDR) - 2010 regarding regional regulatory harmonization as in PRFP-9/OUT-03.

|  |
| --- |
| Decision no. 6 (PRFP-9) |
| The meeting agreed way forward to implement Pacific Regional ICT Strategic Plan (PRISAP) 2015 -2020 and Framework for Action ICT for Development in the Region (FAIDR) - 2010 regarding regional regulatory harmonization as in PRFP-9/OUT-03. |

* 1. Any other business

There were no other issues.

1. Closing Session
   1. Address by Ms. Areewan Haorangsi, Secretary General, APT

Ms. Areewan Haorangsi, Secretary General of APT delivered a closing Address.

In her Address, she congratulated to the new Office Bearers. She thanked the Government of Papua New Guinea and NICTA for hosting PRFP-9 and delivering a very successful and enjoyable Forum. She thanked Huawei and Digicel for hosting dinners during the Forum. She also thanked the Department of Communications, Government of Australia, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, Government of Japan, for their financial support for the Meeting.

She assured continuing support of the APT for the Members in the Pacific.

* 1. Closing Address by Mr. Charles Punaha, Chairman of PRFP and CEO of NICTA

Mr. Charles Punaha, Chairman of PRFP and CEO of NICTA delivered the Closing Address.

The meeting was declared closed.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_