

**PECC Statement to APEC Ministers**  
**Sydney, Australia**  
**6 September 2007**

On behalf of our 26 PECC member committees I would like to express our appreciation to you for this opportunity to update you on our views and work program. Geographically, our footprint is also the same as that of APEC, and we regard ourselves as key supporters of the APEC process as well as other regional integration and cooperation institutions and activities at the regional and sub-regional level around the Pacific. Our member committees typically consist of individuals in the business, academic, and government sectors, the last in their individual as opposed to official capacities. We seek to be a forum for discussion, research, policy recommendation, and outreach on cooperative modes of promoting an economically vibrant Asia-Pacific community.

We wish to congratulate the government of Australia for its leadership of the APEC this year. We note that Australia has sought to extend and deepen an existing work program, and we believe that this is the ideal mode of leadership as opposed to special themes for each year depending upon host. To facilitate effective and consistent action, we hope each successive host government will take ownership of and further promote and see through agreed upon multi-year activities as part of its stewardship of the APEC process.

**The PECC Work Program**

The Pacific Economic Cooperation Council has an active work program based on three types of activities: (1) signature projects, which are reports to the PECC by small task forces of leading specialists on issues of critical concern to economic cooperation in the region, (2) international projects, which are carried out with the leadership of one or more member committees, which enhance the understanding and debate in our different member communities of important issues for Asia-Pacific economic cooperation, (3) member projects, which are carried out by individual committees in their own economies, many of these to increase grassroots visibility of the importance and promise of regional economic cooperation.

We have two on-going signature projects, an annual "State of the Region Report," and a task force on regional architecture. We also have two signature projects in the early stages, task forces on international labor mobility and on educational services. At the same time, PECC continues to maintain a strong interest in regional trade and financial issues, and indeed we believe that the recent stock market volatility underscores the interdependence of our economies and the importance of cooperation in the financial sector.

PECC held its 17<sup>th</sup> General Meeting at the beginning of May here in Sydney, hosted by the Australia PECC Committee. One new feature of this meeting was the addition of youth delegates, an outreach and training dimension that we believe very important to increasing visibility of Pacific economic cooperation among the youth and preparing a younger generation of leaders for cooperation processes.

Our Australia committee jointly with ABAC has recently published a report on "Energy market reform and energy security". This paper broadens and complements earlier work done on the options available in a post-Kyoto environment to ensure adequate economic incentives, particularly through market-based mechanisms, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This is an example of a national project.

Our French Pacific Island Committee has recently published a set of guidelines for effective cooperation on public-private partnerships, an example of an international project carried out under the auspices of one of our constituent committees. Another such project, organized by our Korea committee, is a conference on regional financial centers in Asia that will take place in Seoul on October 15-16.

### **State of the Region Report and Member Survey Results**

The full report on the State of the Region 2007-08 will be issued at the end of October. One element of this is our annual survey of members' opinions, and because of their relevance to this week's agenda, we are releasing our preliminary results early. Almost 400 individuals responded to our survey. They represent not general public opinion in the region, but the views of people with a special interest in and commitment to regional cooperation.

We asked our members what they thought the leaders of our economies should emphasize in their deliberations in Sydney. The two top issues related to freer trade: global freer trade through the WTP Doha process and regional freer trade, as represented by the FTAAP vision. This result is similar to last year's survey, and probably reflects what our members see as the principal comparative advantage of APEC. The next four priorities listed by those surveyed were energy security, strengthening APEC as an organization, climate change, and financial system stability. We are pleased that most of these issues seem high on the agenda for this meeting.

In general, however, our members - particularly our business members - would like to see more determined progress on trade and investment issues. Almost two-fifths of our respondents, 38 percent, regard the continued stagnation of Doha as a "very serious threat" to sustaining economic growth. They recognize, I am sure, that APEC itself is not a trade negotiating forum or a trade caucus, but they would like to see more action in support of repeated statements of support for Doha. Two-thirds of the respondents agreed that they want to see an FTAAP negotiated "as soon as possible." They also feel that Doha and FTAAP can help contain problems associated with the proliferation of the inconsistent bilateral and smaller plurilateral FTAs.

The survey responses on impediments to doing business in the Asia-Pacific region is also relevant to promoting regional economic integration as it indicates priority areas for individual economies and for the APEC group. The top four impediments that respondents found as significant or very significant were an uncertain legal environment, poor intellectual property protection, poor corporate governance, and the lack of physical infrastructure. In fact 73 percent of respondents from the business sector cited an uncertain legal environment as the key impediment to doing business.

As for challenges to the institutional development of APEC, about two-thirds of our respondents (67 percent in 2007 and 63 percent in 2006) regard "the lack of commitment from key member economies" to be a very important or important challenge facing APEC as an institution. Thus, while we support the strengthening of the secretariat and position of the Executive Director, there is clear recognition that the key to visibly improving APEC lies at the level of the individual economies.

Other findings of note are that more than 80 percent of survey respondents believe that India will be an important part of East Asian production networks within the coming decade and 60 percent believe that India should be an APEC member.

## **Other Signature Projects**

I want to refer to our other signature projects briefly. The regional architecture project has an author team consisting of former President Ernesto Zedillo, Professor Joseph S. Nye, Ambassador Long Yong-tu, Dr. Toyoo Gyohten, and Ambassador Ali Alatas. They are working with a support group representing a broader group of economies, and we expect to have a report in the spring. This report will review all elements of the regional architecture that bear on Pacific cooperation.

Our international labor mobility project derives from a Korean international project that will examine "International Labor Mobility in the Asia Pacific Region: Implications for Business and Cooperation." This project will compare the demographic trends in the economies of the region and the different approaches each has taken to the mobility of labor. The subsequent signature project will consist of a working group of 5-6 authors looking at the prospects for a "regime" or set of good governance practices to facilitate international labor mobility. ABAC has expressed an interest in cooperating with PECC on this issue and we look forward to working with them on this issue.

The project on international education services is being undertaken in cooperation with the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU). This project will examine developments in the education sector and the opportunities and challenges they present for regional economic integration and community building in the Asia Pacific. For this purpose, the project will report on trends in the various modes of supply of education services across international borders and identify impediments to efficient international cooperation in this sector.

Finally, the PECC looks forward to Peruvian leadership of APEC and hopes to work closely with Peru through our Peru committee on issues of continuing critical concern to the economies of our vast region.



# State of the Region Survey 2007

---

# STATE OF THE REGION SURVEY 2007

---

## Section 1 : Respondents

### No. of Respondents: 382

Business: 107

Government: 68

Academic/Research: 166

Media: 14

Civil Society: 5

Other: 22

Northeast Asia: 124

Southeast Asia: 104

North America: 57

South America: 46

Australia & New Zealand: 50

No response: 1

## Section 2: Regional Outlook

1) Please indicate your view on the economic outlook for the following regions:

	Much stronger	Somewhat stronger	No change	Somewhat weaker	Much weaker	Don't know	Total
Northeast Asia	22%	52%	20%	4%	0%	2%	100%
North America	1%	20%	38%	38%	1%	2%	100%
Australia & New Zealand	1%	25%	50%	14%	1%	9%	100%
South America	3%	32%	35%	17%	1%	13%	100%
The Asia Pacific	12%	61%	20%	6%	0%	1%	100%

- The 12-month economic outlook for the Asia Pacific as a whole is bullish, with 73% of respondents expecting stronger performance.
- Around 75% of respondents expect the economic outlook for Southeast Asia and Northeast Asia to be stronger in the next 12 months.
- 38% of respondents expect weakening in the economic outlook for North America in the next 12 months compared to 21% who expect a stronger economic outlook.
- 35% of respondents expect a stronger economic outlook for South America, compared to 18% who expect weakening.
- 50% of respondents expect no change in the economic outlook for Oceania.

### Risks to Economic Growth

#### 2) How would you rate the following as risks to the Asia-Pacific economic outlook?

Over the next 1-2 years

	Very Low Risk	Low Risk	Moderate Risk	Serious Risk	Very Serious Risk	Don't know	Total
Avian flu and other health pandemics	16%	27%	32%	17%	6%	3%	100%
Natural disasters	9%	25%	34%	24%	5%	2%	100%
Water pollution and shortages	7%	21%	35%	30%	6%	1%	100%
Global warming	11%	24%	29%	26%	10%	1%	100%
High energy prices	2%	10%	28%	42%	18%	2%	100%
Proliferation of preferential trade agreements	14%	26%	36%	18%	4%	1%	100%
Failure of the Doha Development Round	9%	19%	33%	24%	12%	3%	100%
Protectionism	7%	19%	38%	29%	6%	2%	100%
A sharp decline in asset markets (including stock and property prices)	6%	25%	37%	23%	6%	4%	100%
Trans-Pacific current account imbalances	5%	25%	38%	21%	6%	6%	100%
Sharp deterioration in US-China relations	12%	38%	28%	16%	6%	1%	100%
Cross-Strait relations	10%	32%	34%	15%	4%	4%	100%
Terrorist acts	8%	23%	33%	26%	8%	2%	100%

SOTR 2007	SOTR 2006
<b>Very Serious Risk</b> 1. High Energy Prices (18%) 2. Failure of Doha Development Round (12%) 3. Global Warming (10%)	<b>Very Serious Risk</b> 1. High Energy Prices (27%) 2. Failure of Doha Round (13%) and Terrorist Acts (13%) 3. Avian Flu and other Pandemics (12%)
<b>Very Serious and Serious Risk</b> 1. High Energy Prices (60%) 2. Water Pollution and Shortages (36%), Global Warming (36%) and Failure of Doha Development Round (36%) 3. Protectionism (35%)	<b>Very Serious and Serious Risk</b> 1. High Energy Prices (69%) 2. Protectionism (39%) and Financial Market Volatility (39%) 3. Terrorist Acts and Policy Responses to Them (37%)
<b>Very Low and Low Risk</b> 1. Sharp Deterioration in US-China Relations (50%) 2. Avian Flu and other Health Pandemics (43%) 3. Proliferation of Preferential Trade Agreements (40%)	<b>Very Low and Low Risk</b> 1. Proliferation of Preferential Trade Agreements (40%) 2. Cross-Strait Relations (32%) and Major Power Rivalries in the Region (40%) 3. Conflict in the Korean Peninsula (29%)

### Over the next 3-5 years

	Very Low Risk	Low Risk	Moderate Risk	Serious Risk	Very Serious Risk	Don't know	Total
Avian flu and other health pandemics	13%	27%	27%	20%	7%	5%	100%
Natural disasters	8%	22%	32%	24%	9%	5%	100%
Water pollution and shortages	4%	13%	26%	37%	15%	4%	100%
Global warming	7%	15%	25%	28%	22%	4%	100%
High energy prices	4%	8%	24%	38%	22%	4%	100%
Proliferation of preferential trade agreements	13%	19%	39%	20%	5%	4%	100%
Failure of the Doha Development Round	7%	15%	35%	25%	13%	6%	100%
Protectionism	6%	18%	31%	34%	8%	4%	100%
A sharp decline in asset markets (including stock and property prices)	4%	18%	39%	24%	8%	8%	100%
Trans-Pacific current account imbalances	3%	19%	40%	22%	7%	9%	100%
Sharp deterioration in US-China relations	9%	27%	30%	24%	6%	4%	100%
Cross-Strait relations	8%	31%	32%	18%	5%	6%	100%
Terrorist acts	6%	21%	31%	26%	11%	5%	100%

SOTR 2007	SOTR 2006
<b>Very Serious Risk</b> 1. High Energy Prices (22%) and Global Warming (22%) 2. Water and Pollution Shortages (15%) 3. Failure of Doha Development Round (13%)	<b>Very Serious Risk</b> 1. High Energy Prices (23%) 2. Water Pollution and Shortages (16%) 3. Terrorist Acts (13%)
<b>Very Serious and Serious Risk</b> 1. High Energy Prices (42%) 2. Water Pollution and Shortages (41%) 3. Proliferation of Preferential Trade Agreements (38%)	<b>Very Serious and Serious Risk</b> 1. High Energy Prices (59%) 2. Water Pollution and Shortages (50%) 3. Protectionism (41%)
<b>Very Low and Low Risk</b> 1. Avian Flu and other Health Pandemics (40%) 2. Cross-Strait Relations (39%) 3. Sharp Deterioration in US-China Relations (36%)	<b>Very Low and Low Risk</b> 1. Cross-Strait Relations (32%) 2. Avian Flu and other Health Pandemics (29%) and Major Power Rivalries in the Region (29%) 3. Conflict in the Korean Peninsula (28%)

### Section 3: Asia's Growing Economic Importance and its Global Impact

3) Please indicate your view on the following statements regarding Asia's growing economic importance:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Total
The Chinese economy will be larger than the US economy by 2020.	13%	35%	42%	7%	2%	100%
The Indian economy will be larger than the US economy by 2020.	2%	11%	56%	29%	2%	100%
Chinese outward direct investment will exceed inward direct investment by 2010.	4%	35%	45%	9%	8%	100%
A slowdown in the Chinese economy has greater impact on East Asia than a slowdown in the US economy.	11%	54%	28%	3%	4%	100%
Asian economies should play a bigger role in the governance of multilateral institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.	29%	57%	9%	2%	3%	100%
East Asian economies today are less vulnerable to a regional economic downturn along the lines of the 1997-98 financial crisis.	9%	67%	19%	3%	2%	100%
Asian stock exchanges will account for the majority of global initial public offerings by 2010.	4%	41%	38%	3%	14%	100%
Private consumption will be the engine of growth for Asian economies in the next decade.	12%	68%	15%	2%	3%	100%

65% agree that a slowdown in the Chinese economy has a greater impact on East Asia than a slowdown in the US economy.

85% disagree that India will overtake the US economy as the largest economy by 2020.

Respondents are divided on whether the Chinese economy will be larger than the US economy by 2020.

86% agree that Asian economies should play a bigger role in the governance of multilateral institutions such as the IMF and World Bank

76% agree that East Asian economies today are less vulnerable to a regional economic downturn along the lines of the 1997-98 financial crisis.

80% agree that private consumption will be the engine of growth for Asian economies for the next decade.

#### Section 4: Regional Economic Integration

4) Please indicate your view on the following statements regarding the degree of regional economic integration in the Asia Pacific.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Total
Asia Pacific economic integration in the last decade has been led by government rather than the private sector.	14%	41%	36%	7%	2%	100%
A Free Trade Area of the Asia Pacific (FTAAP) should be negotiated as soon as possible.	16%	50%	23%	6%	5%	100%
On balance, bilateral free trade agreements promote, rather than hinder, the economic integration of Asia Pacific economies.	13%	64%	15%	3%	4%	100%
India will be an important part of East Asian production networks within the next decade	20%	63%	13%	1%	3%	100%

66% agree that the FTAAP should be negotiated as soon as possible.

77% agree that bilateral FTAs, on the balance, promote rather than hinder the economic integration of the Asia Pacific economies.

83% believe that India will be an important part of East Asian production networks in the next decade.

5) How significant are each of the following impediments to doing business in the Asia Pacific region as a whole?  
Please use a scale of 1-5, with **5 representing very significant and 1 being not significant.**

	1- not significant	2	3	4	5 - very significant	Don't know	Total
High Tariffs	6%	24%	33%	22%	12%	3%	100%
Lack of physical infrastructure	1%	11%	32%	37%	18%	1%	100%
Uncertain legal environment	1%	10%	27%	36%	25%	1%	100%
Poor intellectual property right protection	2%	10%	26%	41%	20%	1%	100%
Barriers to investment	2%	14%	35%	34%	13%	2%	100%
Complexity of Tariffs and ROOs caused by the proliferation of bilateral PTAs	3%	16%	37%	33%	9%	3%	100%
Security and political concerns	3%	20%	31%	29%	17%	1%	100%
Shortage of qualified labor	4%	20%	38%	27%	10%	1%	100%
Restrictions on the movement of labor	5%	21%	35%	27%	10%	2%	100%
Lack of mutual recognition of standards	2%	14%	36%	34%	12%	2%	100%
Restrictions on the movement of capital	3%	21%	31%	32%	9%	4%	100%
Poor corporate governance	1%	11%	27%	39%	20%	2%	100%

Most Significant Impediments	Most Significant to Significant Impediments	Not Significant to Not Very Significant Impediments
1. Uncertain Legal Environment (88%) 2. Poor Intellectual Property Rights Protection (87%) and Lack of Physical Infrastructure (87%) 3. Poor Corporate Governance (86%) 4. Lack of Mutual Recognition Standards (82%) and Barriers to Investment (82%) 5. Complexity of Tariffs and Rules of Origins Caused by the Proliferation of Bilateral Preferential Trade Agreements (79%)	1. Uncertain Legal Environment (61%) and Poor Intellectual Property Rights Protection (61%) 2. Poor Corporate Governance (59%) 3. Lack of Physical Infrastructure (29%) 4. Barriers to Investment (47%) 5. Security and Political Concerns (46%)	1. High Tariffs (29%) 2. Restrictions on the Movement of Labour (26%) 3. Shortage of Qualified Labour (24%) 4. Security and Political Concerns (23%) 5. Complexity of Tariffs and Rules of Origin Caused by the Proliferation of Bilateral Preferential Trade Agreements (19%)

### Section 5: Regional Institutions

6) Please rate the following regional groupings in terms of their effectiveness in the following areas, using a scale of 1-5 (5 – highly effective; 1 – not effective; DK – don't know).

#### ASEAN

Response	Trade and Investment Liberalization	Trade and Investment Facilitation	Political and Security Dialogue	Economic Cooperation / Technical Assistance	An opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies	Community Building	Addressing the needs of the business community
1- Not Effective	7%	4%	5%	5%	3%	4%	8%
2	20%	16%	16%	19%	8%	16%	20%
3	32%	37%	31%	32%	22%	20%	32%
4	23%	21%	25%	23%	34%	32%	20%
5- Highly Effective	6%	7%	11%	8%	21%	17%	6%
Don't Know	12%	12%	13%	13%	11%	11%	15%

ASEAN is viewed as moderately to highly effective in first, providing an opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies (77%) and second, in promoting community building (69%).

#### The East Asia Summit

Response	Trade and Investment Liberalization	Trade and Investment Facilitation	Political and Security Dialogue	Economic Cooperation / Technical Assistance	An opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies	Community Building	Addressing the needs of the business community
Not Effective	19%	18%	7%	14%	4%	8%	14%
Somewhat Effective	22%	21%	22%	18%	12%	23%	25%
Moderately Effective	25%	30%	27%	32%	26%	29%	27%
Effective	9%	8%	20%	12%	27%	16%	10%
Highly Effective	2%	1%	5%	3%	13%	4%	2%
Don't Know	22%	24%	19%	21%	18%	21%	22%

66% agree that the EAS is moderately to highly effective in providing an opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies. 47% see the EAS as moderately to highly effective in promoting a political and security dialogue.

#### APEC

Response	Trade and Investment Liberalization	Trade and Investment Facilitation	Political and Security Dialogue	Economic Cooperation / Technical Assistance	An opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies	Community Building	Addressing the needs of the business community
Not Effective	10%	5%	10%	6%	3%	12%	9%
Somewhat Effective	26%	21%	24%	20%	14%	23%	21%
Moderately Effective	39%	40%	34%	36%	22%	33%	35%
Effective	14%	22%	18%	23%	35%	16%	26%
Highly Effective	4%	4%	6%	10%	20%	7%	9%
Don't Know	6%	7%	8%	6%	6%	8%	

Respondents agree that APEC is moderately to highly effective in:  
 Providing an opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies (77%),  
 Addressing the needs of the business community (70%), and  
 In facilitating economic cooperation and technical assistance (69%).

## The ASEAN Regional Forum

Response	Trade and Investment Liberalization	Trade and Investment Facilitation	Political and Security Dialogue	Economic Cooperation / Technical Assistance	An opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies	Community Building	Addressing the needs of the business community
Not Effective	28%	26%	4%	19%	10%	11%	24%
Somewhat Effective	19%	16%	16%	18%	14%	20%	14%
Moderately Effective	19%	24%	30%	28%	26%	30%	25%
Effective	8%	8%	24%	9%	21%	12%	9%
Highly Effective	2%	1%	7%	2%	7%	4%	4%
Don't Know	24%	25%	20%	25%	22%	23%	24%

Respondents view the ARF as moderately to highly effective as a political and security dialogue (61%)

## ASEAN+3

Response	Trade and Investment Liberalization	Trade and Investment Facilitation	Political and Security Dialogue	Economic Cooperation / Technical Assistance	An opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies	Community Building	Addressing the needs of the business community
Not Effective	9%	10%	8%	7%	3%	9%	10%
Somewhat Effective	21%	19%	21%	18%	14%	20%	21%
Moderately Effective	27%	30%	31%	30%	26%	29%	27%
Effective	19%	17%	16%	21%	27%	17%	16%
Highly Effective	4%	3%	4%	5%	12%	7%	6%
Don't Know	19%	20%	19%	20%	18%	19%	21%

Respondents agree that the ASEAN+3 grouping is moderately to highly effective:

As an opportunity for leaders to discuss immediate issues facing their economies (65%), and  
In promoting economic cooperation and technical assistance (56%).

7) Please indicate your opinion regarding the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Total
The East Asia summit process will eventually overshadow APEC	6%	26%	44%	7%	16%	100%
APEC is as important today as it was in 1989	7%	41%	40%	7%	5%	100%
India should be a member of APEC	9%	51%	24%	7%	9%	100%
The APEC Secretariat should be strengthened by appointing a multi-year fixed-term Executive Director and the recruitment of professional staff	22%	54%	10%	2%	13%	100%

Respondents split on APEC's importance today as compared to 1989.

51% do not think that the EAS will overshadow/replace APEC.

76% think that the APEC Secretariat needs to be strengthened.

60% think India should be a member of APEC.

Statement	Total Agree	
	SOTR 2007	SOTR 2006
EAS summit process will eventually overshadow APEC	34%	27%
APEC is as important today as it was in 1989	48%	42%
India should be a member of APEC	60%	61%

8) What are the most important challenges facing APEC as an institution? Please use a scale of 1-5, with 5 representing very important and 1 not important. Please select DK if you are not sure.

Data	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Mod. Important	Important	Very Important	Don't Know	No Response
Lack of focus on relevant issues	3%	12%	33%	30%	15%	5%	2%
Competition from East Asia Summit	9%	18%	30%	23%	8%	10%	2%
Weak international secretariat	3%	11%	29%	31%	16%	8%	2%
Lack of commitment from key member economies	2%	4%	19%	41%	26%	5%	2%
Lack of relevance to issues facing ordinary citizens	4%	15%	26%	27%	21%	5%	2%
Excessive number of meetings	7%	24%	32%	14%	9%	13%	2%
Limited central budget for APEC activities	4%	12%	30%	25%	15%	13%	2%

SOTR 2007	SOTR 2006
<b>Very Important</b> 1. Lack of Commitment from Key Member Economies (26%) 2. Lack of Relevance to Issues Facing Ordinary Citizens (21%) 3. Weak International Secretariat (16%)	<b>Very Important</b> 1. Lack of Commitment from Key Member Economies (28%) 2. Lack of Focus on Relevant Issues (25%) 3. Lack of Relevance to Issues Facing Ordinary Citizens (14%)
<b>Very Important and Important</b> 1. Lack of Commitment from Key Member Economies (67%) 2. Lack of Relevance to Issues Facing Ordinary Citizens (48%) 3. Weak International Secretariat (47%)	<b>Very Important and Important</b> 1. Lack of Commitment from Key Member Economies (63%) 2. Lack of Focus on Relevant Issues (55%) 3. Lack of Relevance to Issues Facing Ordinary Citizens (43%)
<b>Not Important and Not Very Important</b> 1. Excessive Number of Meetings (31%) 2. Competition from East Asian Summit (27%) 3. Lack of Relevance to Issues Facing Ordinary Citizens (19%)	<b>Not Important and Not Very Important</b> 1. Competition from East Asian Summit (25%) 2. Excessive Number of Meetings (24%) 3. Lack of Relevance to Issues Facing Ordinary Citizens (18%)

9) What do you think should be the **top five policy priorities** for APEC Leaders to discuss at their upcoming meeting in Sydney?

Data	Percent of total weight
The WTO Doha Development Round	12%
A Free Trade Area of the Asia Pacific	11%
Managing the proliferation of preferential trade agreements	6%
Strengthening the APEC organization	9%
Trans-Pacific imbalances and exchange rate adjustments	3%
Expansion of APEC membership	2%
Financial system stability	8%
Labor mobility	3%
Protecting intellectual property rights	4%
Energy security	9%
Reducing corruption	5%
Health issues	2%
Investment in physical infrastructure to facilitate trade	5%
Climate change	8%
Terrorism	4%
Reducing costs of business by cutting red tape	6%
Human trafficking	2%

SOTR 2007 (weighted) Respondents were asked to rank the top 5 of 16 policy priorities for APEC Leaders to discuss in Sydney.	SOTR 2006 (weighted) Respondents were asked to rate the importance of 12 policy priorities on a scale of 1-5.
<p>Top 5 Policy Priorities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. WTO Doha Round</li> <li>2. FTAAP</li> <li>3. Energy Security</li> <li>4. Strengthening the APEC Organization</li> <li>5. Climate Change</li> </ol>	<p>Top 5 Policy Priorities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reducing Tariff Barriers</li> <li>2. Counter-Terrorism</li> <li>3. Investment in Physical Infrastructure to Facilitate Trade</li> <li>4. Preparing for Disease Pandemics</li> <li>5. Reducing Corruption and Increasing Transparency</li> </ol>