Agenda Item 15: Report of the APPU / UPU Reform Working Group

Workstream 3 (WS 3), Sub-item 15.3.1: New work of a functional nature – update on 2018 membership survey

Presentation by New Zealand

1. Subject	**References/paragraphs**
Informing APPU members on: - the actions taken following the finalisation of the 2018 membership survey - those areas where discussion or feedback in the WG session at the Tokyo EC meeting has been requested	 § 2.2, Annex 1 § 3, Annex 2
2. Decisions expected The EC, via the WG, is asked to: - **note** that all actions arising from the membership survey have been either initiated or completed - **note** that feedback on nine specific items requested during the WG session at the Tokyo EC meeting will be: • reported on, separately, to the EC Plenary; and • included in an updated version of Annex 1 for ongoing management of the membership survey action points	 § 2.2, Annex 1 § 3, Annex 2

1. Introduction

1.1 This document updates the EC, through the APPU / UPU Reform Working Group (Reform WG), of the status regarding the 37 actions identified in the 2018 membership survey.

2. Update summary

2.1 The detailed position regarding 37 actions is set out in EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1 Annex 1. The summary of the various actions is in the table below.

Status Ref.	Status	No. of Actions
1	Ongoing action item	**6**
2	Under action	**13**
3	Completed and awaiting feedback	**4**
4	Completed	**6**
5	No action required	**8**

3. Comment

3.1 There are nine items from the survey for discussion in the Tokyo WG session – these are at EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1 Annex 2, including notes that may be useful as a discussion guide.

3.2 Feedback from the WG discussion will be summarised for separate report to the EC Plenary. The feedback will also be used to update the membership survey schedule at Annex 1.

Updated Schedule of Actions on Survey Feedback					EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1 Annex 1
Report Ref.	**Survey Topic**	**Feedback / Proposal Made in Survey**	**Working Group Comment**	**Status of Action: Update (numbers in brackets (e.g., (2)) relate to "Status Ref" in the table in paragraph 2.1 of EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1)**	
	What is the <u>most</u> <u>important</u> benefit you look to the APPU to provide you with?				
A.1.1	Connection to the UPU for technical assistance	No members selected this option.	Noted	UPU Regional Coordinator advised (4)	
A.1.2	Member of a regional grouping for consultation on key global matters, advice and support of key UPU issues	8 members selected this option.	Ensure that this main value to members: 1. Is prominent, as a principle, in all that the APPU does. 2. Influences the agenda of APPU meetings. 3. Is a key element in the recruitment of the next Director	Raise for discussion in WG meeting (2)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** Is there more that we could be doing at meetings in terms of briefing on key global matters? What is the desirable background of the next Secretary General in relation to this membership benefit?
A.1.3	The opportunity to have a voice in regional and global matters	3 members selected this option.	Noted	No action required (5)	
A.1.4	Training	2 members selected this option.	Noted	Training Section made aware of comment (4)	
A.1.5	Other	1 member selected this option i.e., a forum for the exchange and enhancement of best-practice.	Noted	Try to have some best-practice content in EC meetings (e.g., Tokyo Supply Chain Integration WG)	
	What is the <u>least</u> <u>interesting</u> aspect of the APPU for you?				
A.2.1		The College activities	Noted as minor issue	No action required (5)	
A.2.2		To be in a regional organisation	Noted as minor issue	No action required (5)	
A.2.3		APPU is less relevant to business and less connected with the global context (2 respondents)	Noted as minor issue, but dealt with elsewhere in the management of feedback	Dealt with elsewhere (5)	
A.2.4		UPU technical assistance	Noted as minor issue	No action required (5)	
	If you could change the format and / or content of the EC meetings, what would you change?				
A.3.1		Suggest increasing regional projects in order to stimulate business synergy among designated operators in Asia Pacific.	This seems to be more for the APP Cooperative	Taken up with APP Cooperative (2)	
A.3.2		Given the apparent interest and participation in the POC C 3 E-Services and Markets Development Working Group, whether this session could be reduced to one hour?	This is a scheduling issue when setting the agenda and timings for EC meetings.	Actioned (4)	
A.3.3		There needs to be more active participation and more business-oriented approaches from members at EC meetings. It is an opportunity to come together and forge one voice as a regional group.	Agreed, but to date the Union has not identified how this can be achieved. Perhaps one way of responding to this item is to organise more business sessions at EC meetings.	Timing limitations made this difficult for the Tokyo EC meeting. That said, there is an APP session on Innovation. To be noted for future years. (1)	
A.3.4		Too many Presentations focused rather than to take an emphasis on discussions on vital matters having implications for the member countries as a whole.	Working Group not aware of the extent of this issue	Under action (2)	
A.3.5		Agree that APPU may explore more regional business opportunities and cooperation.	This may be a topic for the APP Cooperative	Taken up with APP Cooperative (2)	

Report Ref.	Survey Topic	Feedback / Proposal Made in Survey	Working Group Comment	Status of Action: Update (numbers in brackets (e.g., (2)) relate to "Status Ref" in the table in paragraph 2.1 of EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1)	
A.3.6		More business-oriented (2 respondents). A thematic forum on an issue of critical importance should be given due time during the EC	EC meetings in the past (e.g., the 2009-2013 cycle) have featured extended sessions on business issues and common interests particularly in the commercial market. During the 2013-2017 cycle there was discussion of adding a day to EC meetings to provide the opportunity to hold business sessions. However, that appears to have been overlooked at subsequent EC meetings. With members continuing to request the organs of the Union to work more closely together, a business session organised and managed by the EC / Bureau / APP could be a worthwhile initiative that meets dual objectives (i.e., providing business focus and the Union's organs working more closely together)	This is a very important element in the future direction and purpose of the APPU. Partly it revolves around the planning and organisation of the EC meetings (and Congress). Relying on a formula approach to annual meetings (i.e., organisation of agenda) is acceptable for those items that are standard reporting matters. However, for generating interest, relevance, value and liveliness at a meeting, significant input is required. This needs to be worked on under the leadership of the Bureau / EC Chair / host country of meeting. Not able to be implemented for Tokyo 2019. However, to be top-of-mind for 2020 EC. (1)	
A.3.7		APPU should review and update the topic each year. APPU may organize the Preparatory meetings on specific issues of the UPU that affect member countries, such as the contribution system and Integrated Product Plan or Integrated Remuneration Plan for the members to have time to prepare and discuss together. (1 respondent)	This seems to be a proposal for the Bureau to undertake annual updates of key topics that affect members.	This is partly achieved through the focus of WG sessions. However, there may be a need for more agenda-planning to be initiated by the Bureau. This could be an ideal area of development for the relocated RTCAP Manager. Assigned to Bureau for action. (1)	
A.3.8		The work and the documents of the APPU Finance Committee. At both the 2017 Tehran Congress, and again at the 2018 Da Nang EC, we saw several examples of inaccuracies in the documents. We would strongly suggest that a very *thorough and comprehensive peer review* of all financial documents is completed well in advance of their circulation.		This has been actioned for Tokyo 2019. Feedback needs to be sought on whether there has been improvement. (3)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** has there been an improvement in the timeliness, accuracy and quality of Finance documentation for the Tokyo EC?
A.3.9		If we could change the format and/or content of the EC meetings, at the first step, we stop holding the APPU-EC meetings on an annual basis. Holding an APPU Congress every four years would be sufficient. All the tasks can be done by the Bureau.	Realistically, this proposal is a "step too far". In practical terms, looking at the agenda and content of the most recent EC meeting, the Bureau would not have been able to undertake many activities without the leadership and support of members (e.g., Working Group activities).	No action proposed (5)	
	If there was one thing you could change regarding the APPU, or its organs, what would it be?				
A.4.1		Clarity, as evidenced by the work of the APPU / UPU Reform Working Group, this is one area that would really help in terms of the discussions and activities brought to the APPU EC bodies and Plenary. The work of the Da Nang EC meeting highlighted the need for greater clarity and provided a roadmap to achieve this. Accordingly, we are pleased to participate in this work, with the view that it will lead to the requisite clarity around the union, its organs, their purpose, role, objectives, management / leadership and reporting lines.	Noted by the Working Group.	Continue with the approach started in Da Nang whereby the APPU / UPU Reform Working Group completes the work on its 2018 EC agenda (EC 2018 - Docs 15.4.1, 15.4.2 and 15.4.3), and addresses other key issues in similar manner at the 2019 and 2020 EC meetings. (1)	
A.4.2		Enhance the coordination & streamline the process among the organs (2 respondents)	There is activity in the 2018-2021 cycle that addresses this matter. That said, it would be useful to get ideas and suggestions regarding coordination and streamlining opportunities.	Bureau to seek input from members on coordination and streamlining opportunities in the activities of the Union's organs. (2)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** this is a frequently quoted objective i.e., "enhance coordination, streamline processes". What is is that members see as coordination enhancement opportunities and process streamlining opportunities?

Report Ref.	Survey Topic	Feedback / Proposal Made in Survey	Working Group Comment	Status of Action: Update (numbers in brackets (e.g., (2)) relate to "Status Ref" in the table in paragraph 2.1 of EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1)	
A.4.3		Work towards greater synergy among the wings and organs of the APPU to ensure optimal utilization of efforts and resources for the intended outcomes and common objectives (1 respondent)	There is activity in the 2018-2021 cycle that addresses this matter. That said, it would be useful to get ideas and suggestions regarding opportunities to achieve greater synergy in the activities of the Union's organs.	Bureau to seek input from members on opportunities to achieve greater synergy in the activities of the Union's organs. (2)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** this is also a frequently quoted objective i.e., "greater synergy between entities and organs to better use resources etc". What is is that members see as opportunities for greater synery so that we make better use of resources?
A.4.4		APPU to review a whole-year syllabus to make topics more relevant and better respond to the harshly competitive environment (1 respondent)	This seems to be similar to Item A.3.6 and should be included with that proposal.	Not able to be implemented for Tokyo 2019. However, to be top-of-mind for 2020 EC. (1)	
A.4.5		Abolish the APPU-EC	This is linked to Item A.3.9 and should be treated in the same manner.	No action proposed (5)	
	Part B: New Topics in 2018 Survey Questionnaire	**Communication**			
	Question B 1 looks at communication issues, understanding communications, and communication preferences of members. The purpose of this is to see if there is any guidance on how more effective communication can be achieved. To provide a response to question B 1, please think about meeting documents, presentations, discussions in both the APPU and the UPU. (For clarity, the question relates to the use of English.)				
	Does your country have any communication issues regarding documentation, presentations, discussions in APPU and UPU?				
B.1.1.1		We believe that there needs to be greater discipline within the APPU, led by the Bureau, to ensure all papers, documents, presentations etc., which are to be heard at the APPU Congress or EC meetings are published, ideally 2 weeks in advance, to enable member countries to have the material translated into their first language, as well as enabling a thorough review of positions to be taken in advance of the meetings. The current approach simply doesn't provide adequate time for this translation / review / assessment / response process at or during the EC meetings.	This is a common issue. If we look at the UPU we find that the IB is active in ensuring documents are available as soon as possible prior to a meeting. However, the APPU does not have resource that can assist in the preparation of documents. This is a crucial difference and one that will continue to make the timely availability of meeting documents difficult to achieve.	This has been actioned for Tokyo 2019. Feedback needs to be sought on whether there has been improvement. (3)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** has there been an improvement in the timeliness / availability of documents for the Tokyo EC?
B.1.1.2		A number of APPU EC documents are described as "Revs" or revisions. While this is completely understandable and normal practice, what is not normal practice is the consistent failure to reflect what changes have been made. Traditionally this is done via a mark-up or redline (as per UPU documents reflecting revisions). We strongly recommend that the APPU also adopt this practice for any documents released after the 2018 APPU EC meeting in Da Nang.	Working Group strongly supports this comment.	This has been actioned for Tokyo 2019. Feedback needs to be sought on whether the improvement has met expectations. (3)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** has there been an improvement in the presentation / marking of revised documents for the Tokyo EC?

Report Ref.	Survey Topic	Feedback / Proposal Made in Survey	Working Group Comment	Status of Action: Update (numbers in brackets (e.g., (2)) relate to "Status Ref" in the table in paragraph 2.1 of EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1)	
B.1.1.3		Documents were not published on the APPU website properly at the APPU EC meeting. If a "paperless" meeting is held, it is essential to publish the documents in a timely manner.	Working Group not aware of the specific issue being referenced.	This has been actioned for Tokyo 2019. The Bureau aimed for documents on the website six weeks prior to the meeting (with most of the Bureau's documentation uploaded five weeks prior to the meeting). The Bureau worked with WG Chairs and other presenters to get documents and presentations as soon as they were available. Feedback needs to be sought on whether there has been improvement. (3)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** has there been an improvement in the availability (timeliness) of documents and presentations on the website?
B.1.1.4		We receive late information. We would like to suggest that any documentations, questionnaires etc are sent by email.	Working Group not aware of the specific issue being referenced.	Bureau advised of the comment. (4)	
B.1.1.5		Meeting documents and minutes of the previous conferences should be uploaded for any inquiries and researches. ‹At least 1 Congress cycle or the previous 4 years›.	This is a very good observation.	Noted by the Bureau for inclusion in proposed Bureau IT review (2)	
B.1.1.6		Some UPU official invitation letters from the UPU have been sent to us late. For example, we received the UPU's fellowship official invitation letter on 24 July 2018 for the Postal Training Programme to be held in China on 16-22 September 2018. Unfortunately, UPU had already accepted two trainees from our Designated Operator (on 20 July).	This is a matter that should be referred to the UPU.	No action required by Reform WG. (5)	
	Could there be greater use of technology (conference calls, Skype, etc) to make communication more effective / easier? If yes, please indicate your preferences.				
B.1.2.1		Greater use needs to be made of conference calls (including Skype, Teams, WebEx) for Working Group discussions and dealing with any urgent issues (11 respondents).	Working Group supports the member feedback.	WG Chairs to take the lead on this and engage their members directly, plus liaise with the Bureau to ensure they have full visibility and, where appropriate, the Bureau can share information with the wider APPU membership. (2)	
B.1.2.2		The format of the meeting should be the same as the UPU conference which any documents can be downloaded via online with updated version. If a member country wants to amend a draft of any document, it can do so immediately.	Working Group to review this proposal prior to forming a view on it.	Intent needs to be clarified in WG meeting. (2)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** does the WG understand what this proposal means? - does it have relevance to APPU?
B.1.2.3		The APPU Bureau should not only undertake a stocktake of its capabilities but should also undertake a stocktake of APPU members' capabilities in this regard. A schedule might be developed showing the capability of each post and its ability to join such meetings. Separately, a review of IT use in providing international postal services may be of value as some members might not be equipped to operate systems such as IPS.POST (thus hindering participation in the global tracking system).	Working Group strongly supports this comment.	Noted by the Bureau for review and possible action (2)	

Report Ref.	Survey Topic	Feedback / Proposal Made in Survey	Working Group Comment	Status of Action: Update (numbers in brackets (e.g., (2)) relate to "Status Ref" in the table in paragraph 2.1 of EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1)	
	Thinking about business communication in general, is there any development or technique that you would like to see in use by the APPU, its Standing Committees and Working Groups?				
B.1.3.1		Suggest adding a new section in the website of the APPU which provides hierarchy charts, general contacts and updated proposals (if any) of various Working Groups and Committees.	Working Group to review this proposal prior to forming a view on it.	Noted by the Bureau for inclusion in proposed Bureau IT review (2)	
B.1.3.2		We would strongly recommend that the Bureau *thoroughly* reviews its email distribution lists, as there are numerous examples of member countries not receiving correspondence, or receiving duplicate correspondence. To this end, we would suggest the Bureau creates a database of all member countries (Ministries / Regulators / Operators), including their membership of Standing Committees and Working Groups, and that this is reviewed and updated by the Bureau on a six-monthly basis.	Working Group supports the proposal.	Noted by the Bureau for action. (4)	
B.1.3.3		Further to this, the Bureau could follow the UPU model for capturing and reflecting Senior Officials, as found in the "List of addresses in member countries" page: http://www.upu.int/en/resources/list-of-addresses-in-member-countries/about-the-list.html	Working Group to review this proposal from a practical viewpoint i.e., is it proposing duplication, or simply a click through to the UPU website.	Raise for discussion in WG meeting (2)	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** is this something we should be doing, or just a "click-through" to the UPU website?
B.1.3.4		APPU could have an online platform where each committee or working group member can exchange information and/or communicate with each other. This will give opportunity to all the members to be engaged in group discussions and be aware of all the changes as well.	In principle, this seems a worthwhile proposal. Potential issues around IT capacity and commitment required to make it effective. It may be best dealt with on a trial basis in the first place.	Noted by the Bureau for inclusion in proposed Bureau IT review (2)	
B.1.3.5		Working group chairs to be more active and liaise with member countries, including to organize, in collaboration with the bureau, remote meetings from time to time in the interim of the two EC meetings.	Two issues with this feedback. Firstly, the desire for WG chairs to be more active. Secondly, holding meetings between annual EC sessions. No issue with chairs being more active. As far as how they do their work, there is already a strong body of opinion for greater use of technology. Actual work methods should be left to chairs to decide, recognising the value of holding special meetings where necessary / possible.	WG Chairs to be advised of comment (5)	

Items for Discussion at APPU/UPU Reform Working Group Meeting: Tuesday, 3 September		EC 2019 Doc 15.3.1 Annex 2
Survey Question and Key Feedback / Proposal Received	**Working Group Comment**	**Discussion Guide for WG Meeting**
What is the most important benefit you look to the APPU to provide you with? Member of a regional grouping for consultation on key global matters, advice and support of key UPU issues	Ensure that this main value to members: 1. Is prominent, as a principle, in all that the APPU does. 2. Influences the agenda of APPU meetings. 3. Is a key element in the recruitment of the next Director	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** Is there more that we could be doing at meetings in terms of briefing on key global matters? What is the desirable background of the next Secretary General in relation to this membership benefit?
If you could change the format and/or work of the EC meetings, what would you change? The work and the documents of the APPU Finance Committee. At both the 2017 Tehran Congress, and again at the 2018 Da Nang EC, we saw several examples of inaccuracies in the documents. We would strongly suggest that a very *thorough and comprehensive peer review* of all financial documents is completed well in advance of their circulation.	This has been actioned for Tokyo 2019. Feedback needs to be sought on whether there has been improvement.	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** has there been an improvement in the timeliness, accuracy and quality of Finance documentation for the Tokyo EC?
If there was one thing you could change regarding the APPU, or its organs, what would it be? Enhance the coordination & streamline the process among the organs.	There is activity in the 2018-2021 cycle that addresses this matter. That said, it would be useful to get ideas and suggestions regarding coordination and streamlining opportunities.	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** this is a frequently quoted objective i.e., "enhance coordination, streamline processes". What is is that members see as coordination enhancement opportunities and process streamlining opportunities?
If there was one thing you could change regarding the APPU, or its organs, what would it be? Work towards greater synergy among the wings and organs of the APPU to ensure optimal utilization of efforts and resources for the intended outcomes and common objectives.	There is activity in the 2018-2021 cycle that addresses this matter. That said, it would be useful to get ideas and suggestions regarding opportunities to achieve greater synergy in the activities of the Union's organs.	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** this is also a frequently quoted objective i.e., "greater synergy between entities and organs to better use resources etc". What is is that members see as opportunities for greater synery so that we make better use of resources?
Does your country have any communication issues regarding documentation, presentations, discussions in APPU and UPU? We believe that there needs to be greater discipline within the APPU, led by the Bureau, to ensure all papers, documents, presentations etc., which are to be heard at the APPU Congress or EC meetings are published, ideally 2 weeks in advance, to enable member countries to have the material translated into their first language, as well as enabling a thorough review of positions to be taken in advance of the meetings. The current approach simply doesn't provide adequate time for this translation / review / assessment / response process at or during the EC meetings.	This is a common issue. If we look at the UPU we find that the IB is active in ensuring documents are available as soon as possible prior to a meeting. However, the APPU does not have resource that can assist in the preparation of documents. This is a crucial difference and one that will continue to make the timely availability of meeting documents difficult to achieve.	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** has there been an improvement in the timeliness / availability of documents for the Tokyo EC?
Does your country have any communication issues regarding documentation, presentations, discussions in APPU and UPU? A number of APPU EC documents are described as "Revs" or revisions. While this is completely understandable and normal practice, what is not normal practice is the consistent failure to reflect what changes have been made. Traditionally this is done via a mark-up or redline (as per UPU documents reflecting revisions). We strongly recommend that the APPU also adopt this practice for any documents released after the 2018 APPU EC meeting in Da Nang.	Working Group strongly supports this comment.	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** has there been an improvement in the presentation / marking of revised documents for the Tokyo EC?
Does your country have any communication issues regarding documentation, presentations, discussions in APPU and UPU? Documents were not published on the APPU website properly at the APPU EC meeting. If a "paperless" meeting is held, it is essential to publish the documents in a timely manner.	This has been actioned for Tokyo 2019. The Bureau aimed for documents on the website six weeks prior to the meeting (with most of the Bureau's documentation uploaded five weeks prior to the meeting). The Bureau worked with WG Chairs and other presenters to get documents and presentations as soon as they were available. Feedback needs to be sought on whether there has been improvement.	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** has there been an improvement in the availability (timeliness) of documents and presentations on the website?

Survey Question and Key Feedback / Proposal Received	Working Group Comment	Discussion Guide for WG Meeting
Could there be greater use of technology (conference calls, Skype, etc) to make communication more effective / easier? If yes, please indicate yur preferences. The format of the meeting should be the same as the UPU conference which any documents can be downloaded via online with updated version. If a member country wants to amend a draft of any document, it can do so immediately.	Working Group to review this proposal prior to forming a view on it.	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** does the WG understand what this proposal means? - does it have relevance to APPU?
Thinking about <u>business</u> communication in general, is there any development or technique that you would like to see in use by the APPU, its Standing Committees and Working Groups? Further to this, the Bureau could follow the UPU model for capturing and reflecting Senior Officials, as found in the "List of addresses in member countries" page: http://www.upu.int/en/resources/list-of-addresses-in-member-countries/about-the-list.html	Working Group to review this proposal from a practical viewpoint i.e., is it proposing duplication, or simply a click through to the UPU website.	**Discussion guide for WG meeting:** is this something we should be doing, or just a "click-through" to the UPU website?