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Secretary General

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1ST MEETING OF THE CORRESPONDENCE GROUP ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN OF THE ASIA-PACIFIC TELECOMMUNITY FOR 2018-2020 (CGSP-1)**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

The 1st Meeting of the Correspondence Group on the Strategic Plan of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity for 2018-2020 (CGSP-1) was held from 7 to 8 February 2017 at APT Headquarter in Bangkok, Thailand. The objective of the meeting was to develop a framework for the draft Strategic Plan of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity for 2018-2020 and to identify the priority areas of the activities of the work of APT for 2018-2020.

CGSP-1 was attended by 31 participants of which 25 experts of the CGSP from 16 APT Members as well as APT Secretariat. The list of the participants can be found in Document CGSP-1/ADM-03(Rev.1).

1. **OPENING AND FIRST SESSION OF THE PLENARY (7 February 2017)**
	1. **Welcome Address by Ms. Areewan Haorangsi, Secretary General, Asia-Pacific Telecommunity**

Ms. Areewan Haorangsi, Secretary General of the APT delivered the welcome address. She welcomed all delegates to the meeting and to the APT Headquarters. She informed that Mr. Myers Techitong, Chairman of CGSP was unable to attend to the meeting but he would participate remotely. She mentioned that CGSP would work through correspondence means but there would be two physical meetings of CGSP in 2017 as approved by MC-40. The full text of her address is provided in Document CGSP-1/INP-01.

* 1. **Remarks by Mr. Myers Techitong, Chairman of the CGSP**

On his online remote Mr. Myers Techitong, Chairman of CGSP expressed his regret not to attend the meeting. He mentioned that he had requested Mr. Ilyas Ahmed (Maldives), Chairman of the Management Committee of APT to Chair the meeting in his absence. He requested the meeting to accept his proposal. He mentioned that the tasks of the CGSP would be very much crucial for developing the draft Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018-2020. Hence, he sought utmost support and cooperation of the CGSP experts to complete the task of the CGSP. He wished that the fruitful meeting and good outcomes.

Secretary General requested Mr. Ilyas Ahmed (Maldives) to take the role of Acting Chairman during CGSP-1 and delver opening remarks.

* 1. **Opening Remarks by Mr. Ilyas Ahmed, Acting Chairman of the CGSP-1**

Mr. Ilyas Ahmed, Acting Chairman of the CGSP-1, thanked Mr. Myers Techitong and Secretary General to give the important task of chairing CGSP-1. He also delivered the Opening Remarks. The full text for his address is provided in Document CGSP-1/INP-02.

* 1. **Adoption of Agenda *(Document: CGSP-1/ADM-01)***

Chairman indicated that the agenda of the meeting is provided in Document CGSP-1/ADM-01. He sought approval of the agenda. Agenda was adopted by the meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision No. 1 (CGSP-1)** |
| The meeting approved the agenda of the 1st Meeting of the CGSP.  |

* 1. **Outcomes of the 40th Session of the Management Committee of the APT Relevant to the CGSP *(Document: CGSP-1/INP-03)***

Secretary General reported the outcomes of the 40th Session of the Management Committee of APT (MC-40) relevant to the work of CGSP. She mentioned that MC-40 had established the CGSP in order to facilitate the work of developing the draft Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018-2020. She further informed that MC-40 appointed Mr. Myers Techitong (Palau) as the Chairman of the CGSP. MC-40 also decided the terms of reference of the CGSP that can be found in Attachment 1 of the document. She indicated a tentative timeline for the work the CGSP (Attachment 2 of the document). She requested the meeting to take note of the outcomes of MC-40 and conduct its activities in-line with the approved terms of references.

Malaysia indicated that the availability of the second draft of the Strategic Plan in September 2017 as specified in the timeline of the work of CGSP could be quite late considering the approval procedure of the draft Strategic Plan in some Administrations. Malaysia mentioned that in its case, a period of two months would be necessary as the draft need to be confirmed by the Cabinet.

Viet Nam also sought clarification of the tentative timeline for the work of CGSP as it was not discussed in details at MC-40.

Secretary General mentioned that the Secretariat submitted the document to MC-40 on the establishment of the CGSP together with the proposed terms of reference and timeline for the work of CGSP. However, CGSP-1 could discuss the proposed timeline and develop a more appropriate one. She added that Agenda Item 11 of CGSP-1 would consider the tentative timeline for the work of CGSP.

Chairman thanked Secretary General and mentioned that the concern of Malaysia could be considered during the discussion on Agenda Item 11. There was no further comment. Chairman expressed his hope that the CGSP would be able to carry out its activities as directed by the MC.

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision No. 2 (CGSP-1)** |
| The meeting noted the outcomes of MC-40 regarding the establishment of CGSP with its terms of reference and decided to conduct it activities according to the decisions of the MC. |

* 1. **Discussion on Organizing CGSP-1**

Chairman mentioned that the tentative programme for the meeting was available in Document CGSP-1/ADM-02. He proposed to have group discussion for the brainstorming sessions. He mentioned that Secretariat had developed three questions for the brainstorming session. He proposed to have group discussion for the brainstorming sessions. It was proposed to form three different groups and each group would consist of experts from different Members. It was agreed so.

1. **SECOND SESSION OF THE PLENARY (7 February 2017)**
	1. **Discussion on the Constitution of APT, Brunei Darussalam Statement and SDG 2030 in relation to the work on the Strategic Plan of APT (*Doc. CGSP-1/INF-01*)**

Mr. Masanori Kondo, Deputy Secretary General of the APT, presented focused points in the Constitution of APT, Brunei Darussalam Statement and the United Nation’s the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development as information for discussion at CGSP. Pointing to Article 2 of the Constitution, he mentioned the Article 2 describes the high level objectives of the Telecommunity. In Brunei Darussalam Statement he pointed to the six key priority areas identified by the APT Ministerial Meeting. He further pointed the 17 goals of the 2030 Agenda of Sustainable Development has 17 goals and the interrelation of those goals with ICT development. The DSG mentioned that the three documents could provide the high level directives and foundations for the work of developing the draft Strategic Plan for 2018-2020.

Chairman thanked the DSG for presenting the key and important documents.

Viet Nam sought clarification regarding the relation between the Ministerial Statement and the Strategic Plan. Viet Nam commented that the current Strategic Plan was developed based on the Ministerial Statement adopted in Brunei Darussalam and for the developing the next Strategic Plan the Ministerial Statement would be missing.

Secretary General replied that the APT Ministerial Meetings were held in four to five years interval whereas GAs were held in three years interval. She indicated that in 2014, the Ministerial Meeting and GA were held therefore the Strategic Plan referred to the Ministerial Statement. She pointed out that after 2014, changes had happened in the dynamic ICT sector and those were needed to be included in the next Strategic Plan. Further, the next Ministerial Meeting might be held in 2019 and until that Brunei Darussalam Statement would serve as the principle guideline for the activities.

Chairman thanked the Secretary General for clarifying the issue. No further comments was made from the floor.

* 1. **Discussion on the Strategic Plans of other related organizations (*Doc. CGSP-1/INF-01*)**

Deputy Secretary General presented the Strategic Plan and related documents of the following related regional and international organizations:

* International Telecommunication Union (ITU)
* European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations (CEPT)
* Inter-American Telecommunication Commission (CITEL)
* Regional Commonwealth in the Field of Communications (RCC)
* Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) ICT Masterplan
* APEC Telecommunications and Information Working Group Strategic Action Plan 2016-2020

Deputy Secretary General briefly introduced the documents and hoped that those would provide information and guideline towards the development of the draft Strategic Plan. Chairman thanked Deputy Secretary General for the introduction of the informative documents.

Malaysia commented that the periods for most of the strategic Plan for five years whereas APT’s one for three years. Malaysia added that three years’ time period was comparatively less to implement a Strategic Plan and it would not be realistic to include many substance/elements in depth there for implementation. Malaysia requested to address the issue during brainstorming.

Viet Nam also associated with the comments from Malaysia andqueried the tenure of the Strategic Plan.

Secretary General informed that according to the Constitution, GA would meet in every three years and adopt the Strategic Plan. This had been the practice of the APT. She mentioned that in 2014 since both the Ministerial Meeting and the GA took place, Ministerial Statement were reflected widely in the Strategic Plan. However, in previous years the case was not such. She further mentioned that GA can consider the tenure of the Strategic Plan in the future.

Deputy Secretary General complemented that Secretariat had submitted a document for the meeting on analysis of the current Strategic Plan. He requested the meeting to consider the analysis and take into consideration while developing the new Strategic Plan keeping in mind the duration on implementation of three years.

Bangladesh commented that feasibility and adaptability were two important issues for a Strategic Plan. Echoing Malaysia’s comment, Bangladesh mentioned that some issues in the Strategic Plan might not be feasible to implement within short duration of three years. On the other hand, considering the rapid changes in the ICT sector, the three years duration provides adaptability to the Strategic Plan so that the new thing are incorporated if missed at the previous Plan. Hence, three years period gives flexibility to the Strategic Plan to adopt the recent changes. Bangladesh also mentioned that completion of a Plan did not mean that the activities under the plan could not be repeated in the next plan.

China commented that the feasibility issue raised by Malaysia was important to consider the implementation of the Strategic Plan in defined time frame. China requested to keep that in mind while developing the next Strategic Plan. China further emphasized the input from relevant work programmes of APT for the development of the Strategic Plan in the same way in ITU. He motioned that in ITU, three sectors contributed to the Strategic Plan of the Union. The DSG commented that last year APT Secretariat had sought inputs from various APT Work Programmes for the draft Strategic Plan. He mentioned that APT Secretariat would continue encourage their inputs accordingly during the preparation of the draft.

Republic of Korea supported the comments from Bangladesh and mentioned that three years period could provide flexibility to adjust the activities of APT. He indicated that in every 15 years Ministerial meeting and GA would occur in the same year. He emphasized that Ministerial Meeting and GA were different and could not be interrelated directly although there were some interrelations. He further suggested the CGSP to analyze to what extent the Ministerial Statement can be inter-related to the Strategic Plan.

Chairman thanked all for their valuable comments and suggestions. He suggested the CGSP experts to consider the points as mentioned in the meeting.

* 1. **Discussion on the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2015 – 2017 and its implementation (*Doc. CGSP-1/INP-04*)**

Dr. Jong Bong Park, Director Project Development, APT Secretariat presented an analysis of the current Strategic Plan and its status of implementation. He mentioned that the Strategic Plan of APT had not been institutionalized in any of the legal documents of the APT and the reference of the development of the Strategic Plan came from Section 6 (a) of Article 8 of the Constitution of the APT.

Dr Park explained the document in detail and mentioned that the analysis was purely done from the view point of the Secretariat. He mentioned that the Strategic Plan was based on the Brunei Darussalam Statement which was made at the Ministerial meeting held in 2014. It had identified priority areas to be focused on 3-year time frame and established implementation scheme through action plans under work items. Even though structure of the plan was a good example, it did not contain timeline, key performance indicators and reporting mechanism inside the plan. Further, he mentioned that the current Strategic Plan provided rationale and justification of the areas of Work Programme for 3 years rather than to identify future possible activities. He expected that the analysis would held the meeting to figure out the key points of the current Strategic Plan and figure out the key elements to develop the new Plan.

Chairman thanked Dr Park for presenting the analysis. Malaysia comment that in earlier version of the Strategic Plans, the KPIs were included which was missing in the current version. Malaysia also added the new Strategic Plan might need to include some baseline KPIs or some timelines over the next three years to monitor the activities. Malaysia thought that some measurable indicators should be useful to Members to monitor the progress and something concrete needed to be done. Dr Park mentioned that the issues raised by Malaysia need to be discussed during brainstorming.

Secretary General confirmed that the Strategic Plan for 2009-2011 included the KPIs but last two Strategic Plans did not include any.

China commented that most of the organizations were adopting result based strategic plans where the expected outcomes and outputs were considered to develop the overall plan. China also commented to investigate linkage between Strategic Plan and Financial Plan as it could facilitate the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Dr Park mentioned that the APT could adopt the result based Strategic Plan by drafting the measurable and concrete outcomes for the new Strategic Plan. He further mentioned that APT did not have multiple years financial plan like ITU considering the organization size compared to ITU. However, the new Strategic Plan might include the issues related to fund availability and financing mechanism as well as implementation mechanism.

Nepal queried about the Strategic Actions in Strategic Plan that could be implemented solely by Member’s own effort rather than collective effort by APT.

Dr Park replied that one such example was Strategic Action 8.2 *‘Work with member administrations to strengthen cooperation with private sector, to seek financing through Public Private Partnership (PPP), to increase expert resources and to improve development capacity’* which requested APT Members individually to increase cooperation with private sector in the respective countries, to seek financing through PPP and to improve development capacity.

* 1. **Discussion on the documents from Members and Secretariat, if any (*Doc. CGSP-1/INP-05, INP-06*)**

Dr Jongbong Park, Director Project Development, APT Secretariat, presented Document CGSP-1/INP-05 on the analysis of strength and weakness of the APT. He mentioned that the document had been developed though brainstorming in the APT Secretariat. The objective of the document was to inform the CGSP the view of the Secretariat regarding the strength and weakness of the APT. He mentioned that the analysis had covered both the aspects of APT as an international organization as well as its activities towards the membership.

Dr Park also presented Document CGSP-1/INP-06 which contained the views of Secretariat towards the possible priority areas of activities of APT for 2018-2020. These possible priority areas were identified by considering the strength and weakness of APT as well as taking a forward looking view to address the challenges faced by its members.

Chairman thanked the APT Secretariat for providing the analysis and views for the work of the CGSP. He asked CGSP experts to consider these documents done by the APT Secretariat. He mentioned that brainstorming sessions tended to identify those points from the view points of the Members. He informed that three questions would be asked for the brainstorming and these questions were available in Document CGSP-1/TMP-01. The questions were:

1. Strength and Weakness of APT and the possible measures to leverage or overcome
2. Framework for the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018 - 2020
3. Possible Priority Areas of the APT for 2018 – 2020.

Chairman requested CGSP experts to divide into three (3) groups and each group to conduct the brainstorming addressing those three questions. He requested all groups to report back to the Plenary the next day regarding their findings.

The meeting was adjourned for the brainstorming discussion in groups in parallel.

1. **THIRD AND FINAL SESSIONS OF THE PLENARY (8 February 2017)**
	1. **Identifying and Prioritizing the Activities of APT for 2018-2020**

Chairman thanked all the experts for their very active participation at the brainstorming. He invited the groups to present the outcomes of the brainstorming discussion. Each group presented its outcomes which could be found in Documents CGSP-1/TMP-02, TMP-03 and TMP-04.

Based on the outcomes reported by the groups, Chairman summarized following points:

1. Identified strength and weakness of APT the groups were almost identical to the one analyzed by the Secretariat in Document CGSP-1/INP-04. However, it was pointed out that SWOT analysis was beneficial but would be more appropriate to be discussed at the level MC/GA. The Strategic Plan should avoid highlighting any weaknesses on the part of the APT. However, based on the identified Strengths, Opportunities which the APT could leverage upon:
* coordinating regional views to develop regional common proposals and positions – WSIS, Internet Governance;
* providing a strong consultative platform for Affiliate Members

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision No. 3 (CGSP-1)** |
| The meeting decided that the Strategic Plan should avoid highlighting any weakness on the part of the APT. |

1. The draft framework should contain the following points as shown in the table:

|  |
| --- |
| Draft Framework of the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018 - 2020 |
| 1. Introduction / Preamble
 |
| 1. Objectives
 | b. Strategic Pillars |
| 1. Strategic Pillars
 | c. Objectives |
| 1. Work Items
 | d. Work Items  |
| 1. Expected outcomes
 |
| 1. Implementation mechanism and Evaluation (KPIs, timeline, financing and funding, reporting system)
 |
| 1. Statement of Impacts/Conclusion/Summary
 |

For the draft framework two possible options were discussed as shown in the table above. It was pointed out that Objectives in point *b.* and *c.* would have different impact on the text of the Strategic Plan. It was suggested to keep the option open and give flexibility for drafting the first draft of the Strategic Plan. After developing the first draft CGSP would review the text and adjust the framework accordingly. The meeting also agreed to task the Secretariat to develop the first draft of the Strategic Plan based on the framework above and taking into account the discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision No. 4 (CGSP-1)** |
| 1. The meeting agreed the draft framework of the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018 – 2020 as shown in the table. The meeting also agreed to keep both the options open as shown in the table for developing the first draft.
2. The meeting tasked APT Secretariat to develop the first draft based on the framework above and use its’ discretion to select from the options.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Action No. 1 (CGSP-1)** |
| The Secretariat to develop the first draft of the Strategic Plan for 2018-2020 based on the framework agreed.  |

1. The meeting identified the following draft Strategic Pillars based on the proposals from the brainstorming groups and discussions on possible priority areas for 3 years. In the new Strategic Plan, “Strategic Pillars” will be used instead of “Priority Areas”. The identified Strategic Pillars of the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018 – 2020 are as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| Draft Strategic Pillars of the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018 - 2020 |
| 1. Connectivity : Building the digital Infrastructure
 |
| 1. Innovation : Enabling conducive environments and harnessing the benefits of new technologies
 |
| 1. Trust : Promoting Security and resilience through ICT
 |
| 1. Capacity Building : Promoting inclusiveness and enhancing expertise
 |
| 1. Partnership : Solidifying strategic cooperation with stakeholders
 |

In addition to the above Strategic Pillars, the following items were identified as being crosscutting issues. The meeting concluded that these items need not stand alone as they are embedded in each of the identified Strategic Pillars:

* Digital Economy;
* Policy and Regulation (e.g. Co-Regulation, Transparency, International Mobile Roaming, Free flow of information);
* Security;
* Privacy / Personal Data Protection;
* Capacity Building:
	+ Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs);
	+ Communities;
	+ Other sectors;
* OTT;
* Big data analytics;
* IoT;
* Green Technology.

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision No. 5 (CGSP-1)** |
| The meeting agreed the following draft Strategic Pillars of the Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018 – 2020:1. Connectivity : Building the digital Infrastructure
2. Innovation : Enabling conducive environments and harnessing the benefits of new technologies
3. Trust : Promoting Security and resilience through ICT
4. Capacity Building : Promoting inclusiveness and enhancing expertise
5. Partnership : Solidifying strategic cooperation with stakeholders
 |

* 1. **Tentative Workplan for the CGSP**

Chairman mentioned that the tentative workplan of the CGSP was indicated in Document CGSP-1/INP-03. Chairman also recalled Malaysia’s concern regarding the availability of the second draft of the Strategic Plan for facilitating Members to receive internal approval. Chairman mentioned that the workplan had been adjusted accordingly covering the concern of Malaysia and the final version of the workplan was available in Document CGSP-1/OUT-02. There was no further comment and the workplan was adopted.

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision No. 6 (CGSP-1)** |
| The meeting agreed the tentative workplan for the CGSP which can be found in Document CGSP-1/OUT-02. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Action No. 2 (CGSP-1)** |
| The Secretariat to follow the workplan of the CGSP and develop the first draft of the Strategic Plan for 2018-2020 by the end of April 2017 and circulate to members in early May 2017 for comment. |

* 1. **Date and Venue of the CGSP-02**

Secretary General mentioned that the 2nd Meeting of the CGSP would be held on 27 July 2017 back to back with the 17th APT Policy and Regulatory Forum (PRF-17) in Sri Lanka. Sri Lanka thanked Secretary General and mentioned that it would be an honor for them to host the 2nd Meeting of the CGSP as well as the PRF-17.

Sri Lanka mentioned the meetings would be hosted by the Telecommunication Regulatory Commission of Sri Lanka in Colombo. Sri Lanka invited all to attend the meetings.

|  |
| --- |
| **Decision No. 7 (CGSP-1)** |
| The meeting agreed that the 2nd Meeting of the CGSP would be held on 27 July 2017 back to back with the 17th APT Policy and Regulatory Forum (PRF-17) in Sri Lanka. |

* 1. **Any Other Matters**

Dr Park mentioned that based on the agreed outcomes of the CGSP-1, APT Secretariat would develop a template for the draft Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018 – 2020. The template would be circulated to all members of APT for two weeks and would seek inputs from members to propose the Objectives, Work Items and Expected Outcomes on each agreed Strategic Pillars. He requested CGSP Members to propose the Objectives, Work Items and Expected Outcomes accordingly.

* 1. **Closing**

Secretary General thanked all the CGSP experts who attended the meeting in spite of their busy schedule. She mentioned the overwhelming participation of the delegates at the brainstorming discussion and fruitful outcomes. She pointed out that meeting completed two important tasks: developing the framework for the Strategic Plan for 2018-2020 and identifying the Strategic Pillars for the activities of APT for 2018-2020. She assured that the Secretariat would provide utmost effort to support the activities of the CGSP. Secretary General also thanked Mr. Ilyas Ahmed who chaired the CGSP-1 in absence of Mr. Myers Techitong, Chairman of the CGSP.

Chairman thanked all the experts for their active participation and reached to good outcomes. He mentioned that he was delighted to contribute as the acting Chairman. He hoped that the CGSP would conclude its assigned work in time and submit the draft Strategic Plan of the APT for 2018-2020 to the 14th Session of the General Assembly. He also thanked Secretary General, Deputy Secretary General and others from APT Secretariat who worked hard for the organization of the meeting.

The meeting was closed.