

**ASIAN AND PACIFIC SKILL
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
(APSDEP)**

APSDEP REFORMATION MEETING

(Bangkok, 8-9 October 2001)

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

The Views of APSDEP Member Countries

September 2001

CONTENTS

1. Background and Introduction
 2. The Questionnaire
 3. The Responses
 - 3.1 Knowledge and Experience of APSDEP
 - 3.2 APSDEP's Activities
 - 3.2.1 Types of APSDEP Activity
 - 3.2.2 APSDEP's Weaknesses
 - 3.2.3 Priority Activities
 - 3.2.4 Programme Themes and Content
 - 3.2.5 Improving APSDEP's Overall Performance
 - 3.3 The APSDEP Website
 - 3.4 Financial Support to APSDEP
 - 3.5 Centres of Excellence
 4. Conclusions
- Annex A: The Questionnaire
Annex B: APSDEP Member Countries
Annex C: Summary of Questionnaire Responses
Annex D: Statistical Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

REFORMING APSDEP

The Views of APSDEP Member Countries

1. Background and Introduction

Since its establishment (with UNDP assistance) in 1979, APSDEP (the Asian and Pacific Skill Development Programme) has provided a valuable - and in some respects unique - vehicle for technical cooperation and the direct exchange of experience and expertise in vocational training among member countries. It has achieved these goals through well-targeted technical meetings, workshop and seminars, and through the exchange of information on technical and vocational training (the latter largely through APSDIN, the Asian and Pacific Skill Development Information Network). In addition it has promoted quality, transparency and the portability of skills through its work on training standards, initially through the development of the APSDEP Model Occupational Skill Standards and more recently the APSDEP Regional Model Competency Standards (RMCS).

Historically, a perceived strength of APSDEP has been its relative autonomy (within the overall ILO structure) and, as a consequence, its ability to respond flexibly and promptly to the expressed needs of its member countries. This has been achieved by a variety of means, which have included annual programming meetings and the establishment of APSDEP 'focal points' in each member country. APSDEP meetings have also been tripartite in character, thus ensuring the full participation of governments, workers and employers in its activities. Unfortunately, although its scope and outreach have expanded, its funding base has remained narrow and has failed to keep pace with a growing demand for APSDEP's services. From relatively "affluent" beginnings (as a UNDP-supported project) APSDEP has in recent years relied primarily on two major funding sources: (i) the Government of Japan through the ILO/Japan Multi-bilateral Programme, and (ii) the regular budget of the ILO, including the Turin Centre. Whilst there have been significant contributions in kind to APSDEP's programmes (for example the work of the Government of Malaysia on model occupational skill standards and that of the Government of Korea in organising training courses in computer-aided design and fellowships in computer-aided instruction), efforts to broaden the funding base through cash contributions have been largely unsuccessful. This narrow funding base has significantly constrained APSDEP's ability to respond effectively to a growing demand for its services and has left few resources for innovation and programme development.

The need to remedy this situation and to broaden APSDEP's funding and support base have been recognised for several years and numerous discussions on the related issues have taken place. In an effort to bring a new focus and renewed emphasis to the reform process, APSDEP called for a meeting of government delegates from member countries attending the 88th Session of the International Labour Conference in Geneva (June 2001). The meeting took place on 19 June 2001 with the participation of government representatives from Australia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, Sri Lanka and Thailand (APSDEP members) and Bahrain, Lebanon and Qatar (non-member Arab States). The Chief Technical Adviser of the ILO/Japan Multi-bi Programme in Bangkok described the APSDEP reform process, highlighting the questionnaire which would be sent to member countries seeking views on APSDEP's performance over the years and suggestions regarding future directions and strategies. He explained that the feedback obtained from questionnaire would form the basis for a meeting on the reform of APSDEP to be held in Bangkok in September/October 2001. Opinions gathered at this meeting would, it was hoped, lead to firm proposals for reform.

2. The Questionnaire

The questionnaire (attached as Annex A) was despatched to the APSDEP focal persons (nominated government representatives) in its twenty-four (24) member countries (Annex B). By the August 17 deadline, completed questionnaires had been received from twelve (12) member countries (50 per cent of the total membership) with a further four (4) questionnaires received after the deadline, bringing the total of completed questionnaires to sixteen (16), or two-thirds of the membership. Comments were also received from Australia and New Zealand but not in the form of responses to the questionnaire, which was viewed as “primarily aimed at recipients of APSDEP assistance”. In total, therefore, 75 per cent of APSDEP members have provided comments on the direction and thrust of the reform process.

The questionnaire is divided into five main sections dealing respectively with:

- I. General Information (having to do principally with knowledge of, and participation in APSDEP activities)
- II. APSDEP Activities
- III. The APSDEP Website
- IV. The possibility of financial support to APSDEP
- V. Others (requesting information on national centres of excellence)

3. The Responses

Annexes C and D summarise the questionnaire responses in statistical terms. They show, for example, how many and which countries (or, specifically, their focal persons) had attended an APSDEP activity at least once and what percentage of respondents fell into this category. The analysis that follows will attempt to look beyond the bare figures to see what lessons can be learned and what pointers emerge for the future direction of APSDEP. It will follow the general sequence of the questionnaire to the extent that this is practicable.

3.1 *Knowledge and Experience of APSDEP*

This section relates to section I of the questionnaire (General Information) consisting of three questions which can be paraphrased as follows:

1. How well are you aware of APSDEP’s activities?
2. Have you ever attended any of these activities?
3. If so, how do you rate the activities?

The picture that emerges is of a programme that is well-known among member countries (only Mongolia and Vietnam claimed that they had “only heard of it”), mainly through direct personal experience (on the respondents’ part) of participation in one or more APSDEP activities. Here the phrasing of the questions may have somewhat distorted the results. As noted earlier, by inviting a personal response from the focal person (“How well do you know about APSDEP’s activities?” “Have you ever attended APSDEP activities ...?”) the possibility that others in government (e.g.: a previous focal person) may have participated arises. For example, it is unlikely that no one from Viet Nam or Fiji has participated in an APSDEP activity or that the last participation from the Islamic Republic of Iran was a decade ago. Overall this suggests that knowledge of and participation in APSDEP activities may be greater than the questionnaire responses suggest.

This distortion is unfortunate in as much as it has encouraged those without personal experience of APSDEP activities to skip the important evaluative question (“how do you grade APSDEP activities?”) A more broadly-phrased question could have encouraged respondents to seek the views of others who might have been involved in APSDEP activities in the past, particularly since ten (10) of the respondents assert that APSDEP is well recognised among their government officials (question 4). Of the twelve (12) countries that responded to question 3, two considered APSDEP activities to be ‘excellent’ while ten graded them as ‘good’. Interestingly Cambodia, while grading APSDEP activities as good, felt that improvements were needed to:

- (i) increase the number of places offered to a particular country;
- (ii) provide adequate pre- and post-activity documentation;
- (iii) increase the number of study visits offered to member countries.

These comments suggest that while APSDEP is ‘hitting the target’ in terms of the programmes it offers, it is not matching the quantitative needs of countries trying to build or rebuild their TEVT systems. Clearly such comments need to be addressed in the context of measures to broaden APSDEP’s resource base.

Overall, however, the impression given by the questionnaire responses is of a programme that is well-known and well-appreciated, at least among a circle of involved government officials. No evidence can be cited as to how widely knowledge of APSDEP’s programmes is disseminated beyond this circle.

3.2 APSDEP’s Activities

Section II of the questionnaire invites respondents to pinpoint APSDEP’s strengths and weaknesses and to prioritise the kinds of activities that are considered useful and the subject matter of course and seminars. The questions, paraphrased, are:

1. Which kinds of APSDEP activity have proved effective and/or in line with national HRD policy (3 options plus ‘Others’ are provided)?
2. What are APSDEP’s weaknesses (6 options plus ‘Others’)?
3. Which activities (subject-wise) are in line with national priorities (6 options plus ‘Others’)?
4. What are the priority themes for APSDEP courses and seminars (5 options plus ‘Others’)?

Respondents were then asked their opinion on how to improve APSDEP’s overall performance within the limitations of budget and personnel, although it is not entirely clear whether this implies the limitations of existing budgets and staffing levels.

There is unfortunately a certain contradiction in questions 3 and 4 where respondents are asked to identify their “first priority” and are then told that there can be more than one answer. More insights might have been gained had respondents been asked to prioritise their answers (i.e.: place in order of priority).

3.2.1 Types of APSDEP Activity

APSDEP activities are grouped into three categories:

- a) organising meetings and workshops on major HRD training issues;
- b) providing information and networking in the field of skill development through the Internet;
- c) developing high-quality training products (e.g.: Regional Model Competency Standards).

Fourteen (14) countries felt that APSDEP's mainstream activity of organising meetings and workshops on key HRD issues had proved effective and was in line with their national HRD policy. Of the two countries that took a different view, Mongolia admitted that it knew very little of APSDEP's activities, while Malaysia, having cooperated with APSDEP for several years on the development of model occupational skill standards, not surprisingly felt that training products such as Regional Model Competency Standards constituted APSDEP's most effective type of activity. Overall, developing high-quality training products drew support from seven (7) members, while six (6) supported work in information exchange and networking. In endorsing APSDEP's work in organising meetings and workshops, Nepal made specific reference to a continuing need for APSDEP assistance in the field of HRD policy and planning.

In summary, the responses represent an endorsement of APSDEP's principal means of action (namely meetings, seminars and workshops), provided that these are properly focused on major HRD issues.

3.2.2 APSDEP's Weaknesses

Weaknesses identified in the questionnaire were:

- a) an insufficient annual budget;
- b) an inadequate secretariat team;
- c) poor support from the technical units of the ILO;
- d) no follow-up activities after meetings/workshops;
- e) few training programmes or activities that matched countries' main concerns;
- f) inadequate involvement of employers' and workers' groups;
- g) others.

Unsurprisingly, perhaps, half of the respondents felt that APSDEP's budget was insufficient for it to respond adequately to identified needs. Three (3) countries highlighted weaknesses in the secretariat team and a further three (3) felt that the support of the technical units of the ILO was poor. On a related point, Japan drew attention to a problem that has dogged APSDEP since its inception, namely the fact that - despite statutes and numerous proposals on the subject - the status of APSDEP within the ILO structure remains undefined.

Of more immediate practical importance, however, is the view from half the member countries that the impact of APSDEP meetings/workshops was severely diminished by a lack of follow-up activities. On this issue, Pakistan felt that follow-up activities should be strengthened and that a mechanism should be devised to monitor and measure achievements. Pakistan also felt that appointing APSDEP staff members from member countries would encourage the commitment of

those countries to follow-up activities¹. Clearly the inadequacy of follow-up activities is closely linked to insufficient budgets, but it also points to the need for workshops and training courses to be designed as part of a broader strategic approach to key issues in HRD.

3.2.3 Priority Activities

As noted above, the value of the responses to this section of the questionnaire is somewhat diminished by the failure to prioritise. The possibilities (paraphrased) were:

- a) providing training on a range of skill-related issues associated with rapid industrial change;
- b) improving access to vocational training for vulnerable groups;
- c) promoting social dialogue in vocational training;
- d) sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training among government officials and workers' and employers' organisations;
- e) capacity building for workers' and employers' organisations to plan/implement skill training;
- f) conducting research and studies into skill development issues;
- g) others.

Some countries identified as many as five (5) priorities (six in the case of Iran) whereas one, Korea, indicated only two priority areas.

There was overwhelming support for vocational training linked to rapid industrial change, the only exception being Lao P.D.R. (a reasonable reflection of the level of industrial development in an economy dominated by agriculture, forestry and hydro electric power generation). Linked to this was I.R. Iran's suggestion of programmes on vocational training policy development for the application of advanced technology. Ten (10) countries supported sharing experiences, expertise and information amongst government officials and workers' and employers' organisations, while nine (9) indicated that training for women, youth and disabled persons was a priority. Eight (8) countries favoured an APSDEP role in research and studies on skill development. Only three (3) countries prioritised promoting social dialogue in vocational training, which suggests that others may not have been too sure as to what this implied. Sri Lanka indicated that the supply and updating of model competency standards was a priority.

In the absence of a priority ranking system, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions regarding relative priorities, although it seems clear that training for the application of new industrial technologies is widely viewed as important. Strengthening the capacity of workers' and employers' organisations to carry out skill training attracted no support (except in Lao P.D.R), a not altogether surprising outcome given that questionnaires were sent only to government focal persons.

3.2.4 Programme Themes and Content

Question 4 focused on training courses and seminars. Member countries were asked to indicate priorities from amongst:

¹ There is some anecdotal evidence from the period (pre-1991) when APSDEP had technical staff drawn from several member countries to support this view.

- a) courses or seminars on information technology, use of the Internet etc.;
- b) courses or seminars related to skills development for rapidly changing industries;
- c) 'traditional' craft courses (e.g.: electrical, automotive, welding);
- d) programmes for vulnerable groups (women, youth, people with disabilities);
- e) others.

In many respects these categories were an elaboration of some of the questions under III, so it is unsurprising that all countries with one exception again favoured courses dealing with skills needed to support rapid industrial change. This time the 'odd man out' was Malaysia, which favoured programmes on training delivery systems such as competency-based training and dual system training. Courses on information technology, computer utilisation and the Internet also attracted support (eight countries). Interestingly, although nine (9) countries had supported improved access to training for special (vulnerable) groups (in Question 3), only five (5) felt that course/seminars for women, youth and those with disabilities were a priority.

Six (6) countries made proposals for courses not listed in the question:

Cambodia was interested in a seminar on enhancing the quality and impact of vocational training;

Iran wanted seminars on on-the-job training and, echoing its support for programmes related to industrial transformation, on procedures for adapting national training systems to the needs of advanced technology;

Lao P.D.R. wanted a programme on management and evaluation of training systems;

Malaysia was interested in training delivery systems (as noted earlier);

Sri Lanka provided an extensive list of programmes it would like APSDEP to offer, including

- training needs analysis
- training planning
- training quality management and quality assurance
- labour market information systems
- financing training
- management of training systems and institutes;

Thailand felt that courses in the management of vocational training institutions (building management capacity) would be useful.

There seems to be a clear signal here that member countries would like APSDEP to renew its earlier focus on enhancing the quality and impact of vocational training by giving more emphasis to planning and management at both the training system and training institution levels. This is in distinct contrast to existing programmes, which concentrate largely on the tools and techniques of training and on training for specific groups.

3.2.5 *Improving APSDEP's Overall Performance*

Suggestions were sought on how to improve APSDEP's overall performance within the limitations of its budget and personnel. This, of course, is a key question that perhaps deserved to be elaborated (performance in specific areas, for example). Nor is it clear whether the limitations referred to are those imposed by existing funding and staffing levels. One country, China, declined to respond, making the reasonable point that this was precisely the purpose of the October meeting.

There was no overall consensus on the route to improvement. Some members focused on efforts to clarify APSDEP's role vis à vis other international organisations (Thailand identified the need to avoid duplication in the choice of seminar subjects and on collaboration and cost-sharing). Sri Lanka wanted to see a revival of the system whereby designated centres would undertake APSDEP activities and urged the greater use of resource persons from within the region. Malaysia felt that APSDEP's impact at the national level could be enhanced by selecting what it described as "effective country representatives" (focal persons?)

Several countries saw a greater role for APSDEP as a catalyst for regional technical cooperation. Iran, for example, felt that APSDEP should assist in organising "mutual assistance between training institutions within the region". This is significant as it reminds APSDEP of one of the main reasons for its establishment, a role that appears to have been largely overlooked in recent years. Fiji saw APSDEP's catalytic role in terms of "providing a development framework by kick-starting projects to be funded by the members themselves" although this proposal involved financial inputs from APSDEP which would need to be further discussed.

APSDEP's original core mandate is also recalled in the comments from India and Japan. India made specific proposals regarding APSDEP's role in facilitating "the flow and use of information on vocational training among countries of the region" and recommended the establishment of a "specialised data base" covering areas such as training research, training materials, trade standards and testing, curriculum standards and vocation training legislation. This was underlined by Japan, which recommended the "exchange of information to strengthen [the APSDEP] network and promote mutual understanding". These observations need to be viewed in the light of comments on the APSDEP website which appear in the next section of the analysis.

Other comments range from a re-iteration of the need to strengthen follow-up activities (Bangladesh), through practical measures such as offering programmes on a cost-recovery basis (Pakistan), to simple improvements such as publishing a list of planned training courses and seminars (Cambodia).

Unsurprisingly, the responses do not add up to a unified agenda for change. They do, however, point up certain areas which, it is felt, APSDEP is currently failing to address and certain intervention strategies which characterised APSDEP's early years but which have recently been neglected - notably the role of APSDEP as a promoter and facilitator of regional technical cooperation. As such, the responses provide a valuable input to the process of reform and should help stimulate debate at the October meeting.

3.3 The APSDEP Website

The questions in section III seek to establish members' awareness of the APSDEP website, their appreciation of its potential, and their views as to its future contents.

The responses to the question: "Are you aware of the APSDEP website?" are consistent throughout. Twelve (12) of the sixteen respondents (75 per cent) were (a) aware of the website (but rarely visit it), and (b) felt that the web site could be a powerful tool in promoting APSDEP if it were improved. Alone amongst the respondents aware of the website, Thailand felt that the website was already well-designed. Vietnam, on the other hand, did not know that APSDEP has a website but felt that it would not be useful in promoting APSDEP. Somewhat oddly, Cambodia and Lao P.D.R. did not know APSDEP had a website but said that it was already well-designed! In the Cambodian case, the point appears to be that APSDEP should provide the equipment needed to access the website. Identified areas for improvement, over and above the content noted below, included an e-mail facility for sharing information (e.g.: important seminar proceedings); the highlighting of member country activities and their focal points; a facility to enable member countries to update information on the website and follow-up activities; and support for establishing a national documentation centre and information network on vocational training (to serve as a national access point to the APSDEP website).

Question 3 invites views on what should be posted on the website in addition to the basic information on APSDEP currently available. The options presented are something of a mixed bag in that some refer specifically to APSDEP itself (for example, c) while others refer to information on vocational training in the member countries. The information options are:

- a) information on vocational training meetings in the region;
- b) information on vocational training policy and legislation in member countries;
- c) detailed information on APSDEP's activities;
- d) detailed information on skill development (activities) in member countries;
- e) links to other web sites containing information on skill development and vocational training;
- f) others.

Four countries (Iran, Fiji, Korea and Lao P.D.R.) ticked all five options whilst all but one country was interested in information on skill development in other member countries. Information on meetings and on legislation and policy in other regional countries was also seen as useful. Curiously, perhaps, only six (6) countries (37.5 per cent) favoured posting detailed information on APSDEP activities. Sri Lanka also wanted the website to contain details of donor-funded TEVT projects in the region, and details of papers presented at TEVT workshops and seminars.

To the extent that any conclusions can be drawn from these results it would be that an APSDEP website should be less a promotional tool (for APSDEP) and more the centre piece of a regional network of information exchange on vocational training, a point already raised by certain countries earlier in the questionnaire (see para. 3.2.5).

3.4 Financial Support to APSDEP

This is a perennial problem and one that has been put before APSDEP members on numerous previous occasions.

On this occasion, six (6) of the respondents indicated that they thought their governments would be willing to offer “voluntary financial support” to APSDEP. Of these, two (Fiji and Japan) favoured a voluntary lump sum cash contribution, while three others (Nepal, Pakistan and Thailand) indicated a willingness to consider paying a yearly membership fee. China and Japan offered an in-kind contribution of facilities and DSA (for hosting workshops and seminars) and Thailand offered to provide facilities. Curiously, Korea (which has been actively involved with APSDEP over a number of years in hosting/organising training courses under the APSDEP-Korea Fellowship Programme, albeit with support from the Japanese Cash Contribution) gave a negative response and did not indicate any form of in-kind contribution (problems of internal coordination?)

Of the nine (9) countries that gave a negative reply, most cited budgetary limitations as the reason. Two respondents gave no reason and one (Sri Lanka) cited existing contributions to the ILO, the Colombo Plan and the Colombo Plan Staff College (CPSC). The Malaysian respondent was unsure whether his government would be willing to contribute.

Overall, these responses do not suggest that the financial burden of supporting APSDEP is about to be more evenly spread, although the willingness of a small number of countries to consider paying membership fees is an encouraging sign. APSDEP’s relevance to member countries needs to be clearly demonstrated before there can be realistic expectations of broader support.

3.5 Centres of Excellence

Section V of the questionnaire asks for details of ‘centres of excellence’ in the country and falls outside the scope of this analysis. A cursory examination of the centres that have been suggested indicates that most are already well-known to APSDEP and begs the question: what does APSDEP plan to do with the information by way of follow-up?

4. Conclusions

As noted earlier, the questionnaire design was deficient in some respects - particularly as regards the prioritisation of APSDEP activities - and could perhaps have yielded more useful information. Nevertheless, the level of response has been good (two-thirds of the 24 member countries completed the questionnaire, and two others, Australia and New Zealand, provided written comments). Furthermore, many of the responses show that considerable thought has been given to completing the questionnaires. This should encourage APSDEP (and its stakeholders) to believe that it is considered to be still or potentially a relevant organisation/programme. APSDEP now needs to use the opportunity provided by the ‘Reformation Meeting’ to clarify where necessary the views of its members and to ensure that discussions at the Meeting are as focused as possible. It should also take into account inputs from other sources such as the Turin Centre² on strengthening APSDEP and follow-up on suggestions such as that contained in Australia’s response, namely that the ILO should provide members with an evaluation of the current structural arrangements for APSDEP.

² Strengthening the Asia-Pacific Skill Development Programme (APSDEP): Turin Centre Perspectives and Proposals.

QUESTIONNAIRE on APSDEP

Introduction:

The APSDEP reform process has been discussed for several years. APSDEP called for a meeting with delegates from Asia and the Pacific in Geneva on 19 June 2001 to give summary of the role of APSDEP in vocational training and outline the need for reform and its process. Next step in the reform process is to send out the questionnaire to member countries in order to receive feedback on the APSDEP performance over the years and to hear their comments on the APSDEP reform. Finally, all the information received from the questionnaire as well as the Geneva meeting will be collected and analyzed to form vital parts for the final stage of APSDEP reformation discussion, which is to be held in Bangkok in October 2001.

In order to assist APSDEP in the reformation process and to voice your comments or concerns over the course of APSDEP activities in the past years, your kind response to all of the following questions is very highly appreciated. Your comments will be treated as confidential.

- 1) Please select only **one** answer that is the best described your comments or write down your comments on the blank spaces provided in each question, unless multiple answers are admitted.
- 2) Please use additional paper if the space provided is insufficient.
- 3) Please type or use Gothic letters.
- 4) Please refer to the information, which is shown on APSDEP web site (www.ilo.org/apsdep).

I. General Matters:

1. How well do you know about APSDEP's activities?
 - a) Not well, only heard of it
 - b) Well, I have attended APSDEP activities at least once.
 - c) Well, but I have never attended APSDEP activities.

2. Have you ever attend any of the APSDEP activities in the past?
 - a) Yes. Year : Name of the Meeting:
.....

 - b) No. (please skip question no. 3)

3. If you have ever attended any of the APSDEP activities, how do you grade the activities?
 - a) Excellent.
 - b) Good.
 - c) Average.
 - d) Need to improve greatly. (how? Please give comments)
.....
.....
.....

 - e) Others, please specify:
.....
.....

4. Is APSDEP well recognized among your Government officials?

- a) Yes.
- b) No.
- c) Others, please specify:

.....
.....

II. Activities:

1. Which APSDEP activities are proven effective and/or in line with your country's human resource development policy?

- a) Organizing meetings and workshops on major HRD and training issues (i.e. workplace learning, use of ICT in learning and training, investment in knowledge and skills, recognition frameworks for skills, etc.)
- b) Providing information and network in the field of skill development through internet
- c) Developing high-quality training products such as the Regional Model Competency Standards
- d) Others, please specify:

.....
.....

2. In your opinion, what is APSDEP's weakness? (can choose more than one answer)

- a) Insufficient annual budget (currently our financial supports are mainly from Japan Government and ILO regular budget. The annual budget is approximately US\$600,000.)
- b) Its secretariat team
- c) Support of technical units of ILO
- d) No follow-up activities after selected meeting/workshops
- e) Very few training programmes or activities that match my country's interest or main issues
- c) Private sectors (employers' groups and workers' groups) are not actively involved.
- d) Others, please specify:

.....
.....

3. Which kind of activities do you see is the first priority for your country? (could be more than one answer)

- a) Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.)
- b) Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities
- c) Promoting social dialogue in vocational training
- d) Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.
- e) Strengthening the capacity of workers' and employers' organizations to plan and implement skill training.

- f) Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.
- g) Others, please specify
-
-

4. Which themes of courses or seminars do you see is the first priority for your country? (could be more than one answer)

- 1) Information technology, utilization of computer, internet, etc.
- 2) Courses or seminars related to rapidly changing industries in such fields as electronics, manufacturing, trade, etc.
- 3) Traditional courses or seminars such as electricity, automobile, welding, etc.
- 4) Courses or seminars for specific groups, such as women, youth, people with disabilities, etc.
- 5) Others, please specify:
-
-

5. Please give us your opinion on how to improve APSDEP's overall performance under the limitation of budget and personnel?

.....

.....

.....

.....

III. APSDEP Website:

- 1 Are you aware of APSDEP web site? (www.ilo.org/apsdep)
 - a) Yes, but rarely open the web site.
 - b) Yes, I often open the web site.
 - c) No. I did not know APSDEP had a web site.

- 2. Do you think the APSDEP web site can be a powerful tool in promoting APSDEP?
 - a) Yes, but needs improvement. Please specify:
 -
 -
 - b) Yes, it is already well-designed.
 - c) No, it cannot.

- 3. What do you think should be posted on the web site, besides the basic information about APSDEP, which is currently shown? (can choose more than one answer)
 - a) Information on meetings on vocational training in the region.
 - b) Information on legislation and policy of member countries.
 - c) Detailed information of its activities.
 - d) Detailed information on skill development of its member countries.
 - e) Links to other web sites that contain information on skill development and vocational training.

f) Others, please specify:

.....
.....

IV. Possibility of Supporting:

Note: APSDEP's annual budget is around US\$600,000, of which over 50% comes from the Government of Japan and the rest from ILO regular budget.

1. Do you think your government could give voluntary financial support to APSDEP?
 - a) Yes. (please answer question no. 2)
 - b) No. Reasons:
(skip question no. 2)
2. If yes in question 1, which kind of contribution you see as possible? (This is a survey, not a commitment)
 - a) Yearly voluntary cash contribution in lump sum amount.
 - b) Yearly in-kind contribution³ in term of facilities and DSA⁴.
 - c) Yearly in-kind contribution for the use of facilities only.
 - d) Willing to pay yearly membership fee.
 - e) Paying fees for certain activities.
 - f) Other means of contribution:
.....

V. Others:

Please provide us with following information on excellent training center(s) in your country; (name, address, contact person, phone and fax, e-mail address, and source of funding (government, employers' or workers' organizations)).

.....
.....
.....
.....

End of questionnaire

³ In-kind contributions refer to cash or other contributions, for example, allow the use of facilities, provide cash as DSA, provide local transportation for participants, provide international air tickets for participants, etc.

⁴ DSA = Daily Subsistence Allowance, using UN rate.

APSDEP MEMBER COUNTRIES

1. Australia
2. Bangladesh
3. Cambodia
4. China, People's Republic of
5. Fiji
6. India
7. Indonesia
8. Iran, Islamic Republic of
9. Japan
10. Kiribati
11. Korea, Republic of
12. Lao People's Democratic Republic
13. Malaysia
14. Mongolia
15. Nepal
16. New Zealand
17. Pakistan
18. Papua New Guinea
19. Philippines
20. Singapore, Republic of
21. Solomon Islands
22. Sri Lanka
23. Thailand
24. Vietnam

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Questions	Cambodia	China	Fiji	India	Iran	Japan	Korea	Lao	Malaysia	Mongolia	Nepal	Pakistan	Sri Lanka	Thailand	Vietnam
I. General Matters:															
1. How well do you know about APSDEP's activities?															
a) Not well, only heard of it										✓					✓
b) Well, I have attended APSDEP activities at least once.		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
c) Well, but I have never attended APSDEP activities.			✓				✓								
2. Have you ever attend any of the APSDEP activities in the past															
a) Yes	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
b) No (Please skip question no. 3.)			✓				✓			✓					✓
3. If you have ever attended any of the APSDEP activities, how do you grade the activities?															
a) Excellent				✓									✓		
b) Good	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	
c) Average															
d) Need to improve greatly (see attached page)	❖														
e) Others, please specify:															
4. Is APSDEP well recognized among your government officials?															
a) Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
b) No					✓		✓			✓					✓
c) Others, specify in writing (see attached page)						✓					❖				
II. Activities:															
1. Which APSDEP activities are proven effective and/or in line with your country's human resource development policy?															
a) Organizing meetings and workshops on major HRD and training issues	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
b) Providing information and network in the field of skill development through internet	✓	✓				✓		✓				✓	✓		
c) Developing high-quality training products such as the Regional Model Competency Standards.	✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	✓			✓		
d) Others, specify in writing (see attached page)											❖				

Questions	Cambodia	China	Fiji	India	Iran	Japan	Korea	Lao	Malaysia	Mongolia	Nepal	Pakistan	Sri Lanka	Thailand	Vietnam
2. In your opinion, what is APSDEP's weakness?															
a) Insufficient annual budget		✓	✓			✓			✓		✓	✓	✓		✓
b) Its secretariat team						✓							✓	✓	
c) Support of technical units of ILO	✓				✓			✓							
d) No follow-up activities after selected meeting/workshops	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓				✓			
e) Very few training programmes or activities that match my country's interest or main issues	✓		✓	✓			✓				✓			✓	✓
f) Private sectors (employers' groups and workers' groups) are not actively involved.	✓				✓										
g) Others, specify in writing						❖				❖					
3. Which kind of activities do you see is the first priority for your country?															
a) Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
b) Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	✓
c) Promoting social dialogue in vocational training	✓												✓	✓	
d) Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓				✓	✓	
e) Strengthening the capacity of workers' and employers' organizations to plan and implement skill training					✓			✓							
f) Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
g) Others, specify in writing					❖								❖		
4. Which themes of courses or seminars do you see is the first priority of your country?															
1) Information technology, utilization of computer, internet, etc.	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		✓			✓		
2) Courses or seminars related to rapidly changing industries in such fields as electronics, manufacturing, trade, etc.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
3) Traditional courses or seminars such as electricity, automobile, welding	✓							✓						✓	
4) Courses or seminars for specific groups, such as women, youth, people with disabilities	✓			✓		✓									✓
5) Others, specify in writing	❖				❖			❖	❖				❖	❖	
5. Please give us your opinion on how to improve APSDEP's overall performance under the limitation of budget and personnel?	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖		❖	❖		❖		❖	❖	

Questions	Cambodia	China	Fiji	India	Iran	Japan	Korea	Lao	Malaysia	Mongolia	Nepal	Pakistan	Sri Lanka	Thailand	Vietnam
III. APSDEP Web site:															
1. Are you aware of APSDEP web site?															
a) Yes, but rarely open the web site		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
b) Yes, I often open the web site															
c) No, I did not know APSDEP had a web site	✓							✓		✓					✓
2. Do you think the APSDEP web site can be a powerful tool in promoting APSDEP?															
a) Yes, but needs improvement. Please specify.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
b) Yes, its is already well-designed.	✓							✓						✓	
c) No, it cannot.															✓
3. What do you think should be posted on the web site, besides the basic information about APSDEP which is currently shown?															
a) Information on meetings on vocational training in the region	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	
b) Information on legislation and policy of member countries	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓		✓
c) Detailed information of its activities			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓					✓		
d) Detailed information on skill development of its member countries	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
e) Links to other web sites that contain information on skill development and vocational training	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	
f) Others, please specify													❖		
IV. Possibility of Supporting:															
1. Do you think your government could give voluntary financial support to APSDEP?															
a) Yes		✓	✓			✓					✓	✓		✓	
b) No. Reasons specify in writing	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓		✓			✓		✓
2. If yes in question 1, which kind of contribution you see as possible?															
a) Yearly voluntary cash contribution in lump sum amount.			✓			✓									
b) Yearly in-kind contribution in term of facilities and DSA		✓				✓									
c) Yearly in-kind contribution for the use of facilities only														✓	
d) Willing to pay yearly membership fee											✓	✓		✓	
e) Paying fees for certain activities															
f) Other means of contribution															
V. Others															
Please provide us with following information on excellent training center(s) in country.	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖	❖		❖	❖	❖	❖	❖

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Information:

There are total of 15 countries (out of 24 countries) that have completed the questionnaires. These countries are shown below: -

- Cambodia
- China
- Fiji
- India
- Iran
- Japan
- Republic of Korea
- Lao PDR
- Malaysia
- Mongolia
- Nepal
- Pakistan
- Sri Lanka
- Thailand
- Vietnam

Australia and New Zealand have also responded to our questionnaire request but not in response to our questions shown in the questionnaires. They informed us that they were not in a position to give comments concerning the future of APSDEP as they were not directly involved with our activities and have not been in contact with APSDEP for many years.

The following result has been gathered from the above 15 countries on the selection of choices they have given to APSDEP. The written comments were separated and summarized in other sheet. Please also note that the answer to our questionnaire was requested for only one answer per question unless otherwise indicated.

The percentage of response shown below derived from the total number of the respondents in each question because some questions only received response from 6 countries.

I. General Matters:

5. How well do you know about APSDEP's activities?
- | | |
|---|---------|
| d) Not well, only heard of it | = 14.3% |
| e) Well, I have attended APSDEP activities at least once. | = 71.4% |
| f) Well, but I have never attended APSDEP activities. | = 14.3% |
- ** One country skipped this question.
6. Have you ever attend any of the APSDEP activities in the past?
- | | |
|---|---------|
| e) Yes. Year : Name of the Meeting: | = 73.3% |
| f) No. (please skip question no. 3) | = 26.7% |
7. If you have ever attended any of the APSDEP activities, how do you grade the activities?
- | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| f) Excellent. | = 18.2% (2 countries) |
| g) Good. | = 81.8% (9 countries) |
| h) Average. | |

i) Need to improve greatly. (how? Please give comments)

.....
.....
.....

j) Others, please specify:

.....
.....

** There are 4 countries that did not give any comments to this question.

8. Is APSDEP well recognized among your Government officials?

d) Yes. = 64.3%

e) No. = 28.6%

f) Others, please specify: = 7.1 %

.....
.....

** There is 1 country skipped this question.

II. Activities:

6. Which APSDEP activities are proven effective and/or in line with your country's human resource development policy?

e) Organizing meetings and workshops on major HRD and training issues (i.e. workplace learning, use of ICT in learning and training, investment in knowledge and skills, recognition frameworks for skills, etc.) = 86.7%

f) Providing information and network in the field of skill development through internet = 40.0%

g) Developing high-quality training products such as the Regional Model Competency Standards = 46.7%

h) Others, please specify:

.....
.....

** There are 8 countries that submitted more than 1 answer.

7. In your opinion, what is APSDEP's weakness? (can choose more than one answer)
- f) Insufficient annual budget (currently our financial supports are mainly from Japan Government and ILO regular budget. The annual budget is approximately US\$600,000.) = 53.3%
 - g) Its secretariat team = 20.0%
 - h) Support of technical units of ILO = 20.0%
 - i) No follow-up activities after selected meeting/workshops = 46.7%
 - j) Very few training programmes or activities that match my country's interest or main issues = 46.7%
 - g) Private sectors (employers' groups and workers' groups) are not actively involved. = 13.3%
 - h) Others, please specify: = 13.3%

.....

.....

**** There are 12 countries that submitted more than 1 answer**

8. Which kind of activities do you see is the first priority for your country? (could be more than one answer)
- h) Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.) = 92.8%
 - i) Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities = 57.1%
 - j) Promoting social dialogue in vocational training = 21.4%
 - k) Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations. = 64.3%
 - l) Strengthening the capacity of workers' and employers' organizations to plan and implement skill training. = 14.3%
 - m) Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues. = 64.3%
 - n) Others, please specify

.....

.....

**** All of the countries, except Pakistan (no submission), submitted more than one answer.**

9. Which themes of courses or seminars do you see is the first priority for your country? (could be more than one answer)
- 6) Information technology, utilization of computer, internet, etc. = 57.1%
 - 7) Courses or seminars related to rapidly changing industries in such fields as electronics, manufacturing, trade, etc. = 92.8%
 - 8) Traditional courses or seminars such as electricity, automobile, welding, etc. = 21.4%
 - 9) Courses or seminars for specific groups, such as women, youth, people with disabilities, etc. = 28.6%
 - 10) Others, please specify: = 42.8%

.....

.....

** 2 countries submitted only 1 answer, Pakistan did not submit any, the rest submitted more than 1 answer.

10. Please give us your opinion on how to improve APSDEP's overall performance under the limitation of budget and personnel?

.....
.....
.....
.....

** Please see additional summary report on the written comments.

III. APSDEP Website:

2 Are you aware of APSDEP web site? (www.ilo.org/apsdep)

- d) Yes, but rarely open the web site. = 73.3%
- e) Yes, I often open the web site. = 0.0%
- f) No. I did not know APSDEP had a web site. = 26.7%

4. Do you think the APSDEP web site can be a powerful tool in promoting APSDEP?

- d) Yes, but needs improvement. Please specify: = 73.3% (did not specify)

.....
.....

- e) Yes, it is already well-designed. = 20.0%
- f) No, it cannot. = 6.7%

5. What do you think should be posted on the web site, besides the basic information about APSDEP, which is currently shown? (can choose more than one answer)

- g) Information on meetings on vocational training in the region. = 66.7%
- h) Information on legislation and policy of member countries. = 73.3%
- i) Detailed information of its activities. = 40.0%
- j) Detailed information on skill development of its member countries. = 93.3%
- k) Links to other web sites that contain information on skill development and vocational training. = 66.7%
- l) Others, please specify: = 6.7%

.....
.....

IV. Possibility of Supporting:

Note: APSDEP's annual budget is around US\$600,000, of which over 50% comes from the Government of Japan and the rest from ILO regular budget.

3. Do you think your government could give voluntary financial support to APSDEP?

- c) Yes. (please answer question no. 2) = 42.8%
- d) No. Reasons:
(skip question no. 2) = 57.2%

**** One country skipped this question.**

4. If yes in question 1, which kind of contribution you see as possible? (This is a survey, not a commitment)

- g) Yearly voluntary cash contribution in lump sum amount. = 33.3%
- h) Yearly in-kind contribution⁵ in term of facilities and DSA⁶. = 33.3%
- i) Yearly in-kind contribution for the use of facilities only. = 16.7%
- j) Willing to pay yearly membership fee. = 50.0%
- k) Paying fees for certain activities. = 0%
- l) Other means of contribution : = 0%

.....
**** Only 6 countries responded to this question. Four countries submitted one answer, the other 2 countries (Thailand chose c and d; and Japan chose a and b) submitted 2 answers.**

V. Others:

Please provide us with following information on excellent training center(s) in your country; (name, address, contact person, phone and fax, e-mail address, and source of funding (government, employers' or workers' organizations)).

.....
.....
.....
.....

End of questionnaire

⁵ In-kind contributions refer to cash or other contributions, for example, allow the use of facilities, provide cash as DSA, provide local transportation for participants, provide international air tickets for participants, etc.
⁶ DSA = Daily Subsistence Allowance, using UN rate.

ILO/APSDEP Summary Result of Questionnaires
(Written Comments on selected questions)

General Matters:

3) If you have ever attended any of the APSDEP activities, how do you grade the activities?

CAMBODIA: Good.

- The number of participants from Cambodia would be increased from 1 to 3.
- The organizer should provide adequate document to participating member countries.
- APSDEP should provide study visits to the officials of the vocational training department at least 3 or 4 time per year.

CHINA: Good.

FIJI: Skipped

India: Excellent

Iran: Good.

JAPAN: Good.

KOREA: Skipped

LAO: Good

MALAYSIA: Good

MONGOLIA: Skipped

NEPAL: Good

Pakistan: Good

SRI LANKA: Excellent

THAILAND: Good

VIETNAM: Skipped

Activities:

5) Please give us your opinion on how to improve APSDEP's overall performance under the imitation of budget and personnel?

CAMBODIA:

- ***APSDEP shall provide the list of training course and seminar to participating member country every year.***
- ***APSDEP shall provide information request.***

CHINA:

- ***Should be discussed during APSDEP Reformation Meeting in October.***

FIJI:

- ***APSDEP to concentrate on providing development framework to member countries by kick starting projects to be funded by the members themselves. This could be in the form of technical expertise and the provision of initial funding.***

INDIA:

- Facilitate the flow and use of information on Vocational Training among countries of the region.
- Building up and sharing of specialised database in the areas of research, training, material, trade standards, legislation on vocational training, vocational training project curriculum standards, etc.

IRAN:

- Promote technical cooperation among vocational training institutions in the region.
- Assist in the organisation of mutual assistance between training institutions within the region.

JAPAN:

- ***Exchange of information to strengthen network and promote mutual understanding***
- ***More involvement of member countries.***

KOREA: Skipped.

LAO:

- ***Use the international best practice on relating activities***

MALAYSIA:

- Select effective country representative.

MONGOLIA: Skipped.

NEPAL:

- Cover more agendas in one meeting.

PAKISTAN:

- Courses may be offered to the participants of developed / developing countries on cost recovery basis to generate funds.
- Maximize the utilization of internet facilities/communication.

SRI LANKA:

- Utilization of resource persons within the region at a minimum consulting fee.
- Promotion of sub-regional networks/centres to undertake APSDEP activities.
- Creating facilities for on-line dialogue through e-mail for the countries to obtain demand/task oriented information.
- Prepare special projects to obtain funds from other donor sources.

THAILAND:

- Avoiding duplicated activities (training/seminar's subjects in particular) with other international organizations.
- Collaborating with other donor organizations.
- Cost sharing with member countries (annual plan must be agreed upon)

VIETNAM: Skipped.

End of summary
18.09.01

Opinions from the Member Countries on their Priority Areas

All the countries that have completed and submitted the APSDEP Questionnaires (Submission from Pakistan was not completed and missed some pages) pointed out the activities that are their priority areas as follows;

Bangladesh:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.

Cambodia:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.
- Promoting social dialogue in vocational training.
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.

China:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.

Fiji:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.

India:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.

Iran:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.

- Strengthening the capacity of workers' and employers' organizations to plan and implement skill training.
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.
- Providing training on guidelines for policy on vocational training on advanced technology.

Japan:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.

Korea:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.

Lao PDR:

- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.
- Strengthening the capacity of workers' and employers' organizations to plan and implement skill training.
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.

Malaysia:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.

Mongolia:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.

Nepal:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).

Philippines:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.
- Promoting social dialogue in vocational training.
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.

- Strengthening the capacity of workers' and employers' organizations to plan and implement skill training.
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.

Sri Lanka:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Promoting social dialogue in vocational training.
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.
- Supply of the Regional Model Competency Standards and updating them.

Thailand:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.
- Promoting social dialogue in vocational training.
- Sharing experiences, expertise and information in vocational training to government officials, workers' and employers' organizations.
- Conducting a research and/or study on the skill development issues.

Vietnam:

- Providing training on a range of vocational training issues related to rapidly changing industries (e.g. information technology, industrialization, globalization, etc.).
- Assisting members to improve access to vocational training for specific groups, i.e. women, youth, people with disabilities.

**APSDEP REFORMATION MEETING
(Bangkok, 8-9 October 2001)**

**ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE REPOSSES
(Addendum 1)**

October 2001

Introduction

Two countries, Kiribati and the Philippines, provided questionnaire responses after the main analytical report had been completed. In the case of the Philippines, five separate responses (from within TESDA) were sent. The main features of these responses are summarized below. Taking these two additional sets of responses into account, a total of twenty (20) APSDEP member countries (or over 83 per cent of total membership) have now provided comments and suggestions on the future of APSDEP.

I. Knowledge and Experience of APSDEP

The respondent from Kiribati was well aware of APSDEP and rated its activities as 'good'. On the other hand, the respondent pointed out that APSDEP's programmes were "not too well known" among government officials because the country had had little involvement with APSDEP over the years, a problem no doubt exacerbated by the country's remoteness.

By contrast, all five respondents from the Philippines felt that APSDEP was well recognised among government officials. Four respondents had participated in APSDEP activities which were considered 'excellent' by two respondents. The multiple responses are useful in helping overcome the 'personal response' distortion referred to in Section 3.1 of the main analysis.

II. APSDEP'S Activities

Because it has had little recent involvement with APSDEP, Kiribati felt it could not realistically comment on the effectiveness and relevance of APSDEP programmes nor on APSDEP's strengths and weaknesses (only the second country not to have commented on these issues). In addressing priority activities (types and subject matter), Kiribati was very much in line with most other countries in requesting training related to rapidly changing industries and on information technology. It was, however, only the third country to prioritize strengthening the capacity of workers' and employers' organizations in the training field and only the sixth to highlight the needs of specific groups.

While two (2) of the Philippines' responses joined the consensus in favour of HRD meetings and workshops, three (3) prioritized high quality training products. Two activity areas not previously mentioned were (i) providing TEVT literature, and (ii) programmes on rural employment for women. Amongst identified weaknesses, three respondents identified the lack of private sector involvement (only two other countries had mentioned this previously). All five respondents added to the overwhelming support in the main analysis for training related to rapidly changing industries. By contrast, three (3) respondents supported promoting social dialogue in training (which had attracted only three (3) countries previously). Reflecting the wider distribution of the questionnaire within TESDA, research on skill development issues was highlighted, as was -uniquely -the need for training courses on research and documentation.

Amongst suggestions on how to improve APSDEP's overall impact (in a tight budgetary environment), two respondents referred to capacity building through technical exchange programmes and the provision of expert services from within the APSDEP membership. The APSDEP secretariat's role in this would, presumably, be one of identifying needs and opportunities and orchestrating/facilitating the exchange process.

III. The APSDEP Website

The respondent from Kiribati and three from the Philippines were aware of the website but, like all other respondents, rarely opened it. However, all the TESDA respondents felt that it was a potentially powerful tool in promoting APSDEP. In common with most other responding member countries, Kiribati was particularly interested in website information on (i) vocational training meetings in the region; (ii) detailed information on skill development activities in APSDEP member countries. All the TESDA respondents felt that information covering at least three of the suggested categories should be posted on the website, and two respondents circled all five options. There was more interest in what was going on in the region than in what APSDEP, per se, was doing. On the other hand, one respondent felt that the website could be improved by posting "full documentation on all ILO-APSDEP activities".

IV. Financial Support for APSDEP

Kiribati became the seventh country to indicate a willingness to give voluntary financial support to APSDEP and only the fourth to favour a yearly membership fee. Two respondents from the Philippines cited the "economic crisis" as the reason for a negative reply. One respondent saw the support in terms of an in-kind contribution for the use of facilities and the possibility of fees for certain services, while a fourth referred to the provision of facilities and facilitators.

V. Conclusion

Overall, the responses from Kiribati and the Philippines do not significantly alter the analysis contained in the main report. Points worth highlighting however are the difficulties faced by countries remote from the main centres of APSDEP activity in "staying in touch" (and, therefore, by extension the importance of a well designed and comprehensive website); the increased emphasis on social dialogue and the role of workers' and employers' organizations; and, as illustrated by the TESDA case, the added value accruing from capturing several different viewpoints within a country or organization.