PIFS GVA/13-2019

To : Forum Island Countries (FICs)
Date : 08 April 2019
From : Mere FALEMAKA, PIF Permanent Delegation to the United Nations,
        World Trade Organization, and Other International Organizations in Geneva
Subject: PIF-Geneva Update 1/2019

Please find attached, for your records, an update on Trade Negotiations and Aid-for-
Trade activities undertaken by the Pacific Islands Forum – Geneva Office (PIF-Geneva) in

2. For further clarifications or follow-up on Trade Negotiations, please contact Mr. Alex
   Kerangpuna, Trade Policy Officer, on alex.kerangpuna@pifs-geneva.ch

3. For further clarifications or follow-up on Aid-for-Trade, please contact Mr. Andrea
   Giacomelli, Trade Policy and Aid-for-Trade Adviser on andrea.giacomelli@pifs-geneva.ch

Mere FALEMAKA

Ambassador

PIF Permanent Delegation to the United Nations,
World Trade Organization, and Other International Organizations in Geneva
1. BACKGROUND

The Pacific Islands Forum Geneva Office (PIF Geneva) comprises two sections: Trade Negotiations and Aid-for-Trade (AfT). The Trade Negotiations section provides policy and technical advice on multilateral trade issues to Forum Islands Countries (FICs) which are members of the World Trade Organization (WTO), and coordinates their participation in multilateral negotiations. The AfT Section assists FICs, individually and collectively, to make a better use of AfT opportunities provided by Geneva and Europe-based organisations.

2. REPRESENTATION

PIF Geneva facilitated submissions by FICs for the 2019 Aid for Trade Global Review (AfTGR), which will be held in Geneva from 3-5 July 2019 under the theme “Supporting Economic Diversification and Empowerment for Inclusive, Sustainable Development through Aid for Trade”. Nine FICs plus the PIFS responded to the WTO AfT questionnaire. This compares well with 2017, when only two FICs responded. As a result, WTO will be in the position to provide some stand-alone analysis of the Pacific responses.

PIF Geneva facilitated responses to the WTO draft report on Trade and Natural Disasters, which should be presented in May 2019 at the WTO headquarters.

2. TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Two meeting clusters of the WTO Rules Negotiating Group on fisheries subsidies were held in January and in February 2019 to progress discussions on the draft text of the Fisheries Subsidies Agreement as the deadline of December 2019 approaches. Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Island and Vanuatu attended the meetings. Discussions focussed on: subsidies to Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing; subsidies to overfished stocks; subsidies contributing to overcapacity and overfishing; and cross-cutting issues. The latter include: special and differential treatment, dispute settlement, institutional issues, and notification and transparency. While two concrete proposals on overfished stocks and overcapacity/overfishing were tabled and some constructive discussions emerged, differences on many technical areas remained. On other areas of Doha negotiations, Members continued to discuss agriculture.

However, Members intensified discussions on the non-Doha mandates or ‘new issues’ such as the WTO reform, impasse on the appointments of the Appellate Body members, e-commerce, investment facilitation, and Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSMEs). The proponents of the e-commerce initiative held a mini-Ministerial Conference on 25 January 2019 in Davos, Switzerland. At this meeting, they released a Joint-Statement to commence negotiations on e-commerce. None of the Pacific Island WTO Members co-sponsored the E-Commerce Joint Statement. PIF Geneva provided an analysis on the joint initiative on e-commerce and some of the new issues to the Pacific WTO Members.

During this period PIF Geneva prepared a Pacific Group Statement delivered at the Informal Trade Negotiations Committee’s Heads of Delegation (TNC/HOD) meeting in February, and sent out seven circulars, including on agriculture, e-commerce, USA paper on the differentiation issues, and preparations for the March fisheries subsidies meeting cluster.

---

¹ Main areas of negotiation include: Agriculture, Non-agricultural market access, Services, Intellectual property, Trade and development, Trade and environment, Trade facilitation, WTO rules, Dispute Settlement Understanding
3. AID-FOR-TRADE

3.1 Projects

3.1.1 Implemented

The office continued overseeing the technical assistance projects supporting its members’ preparations for the WTO Trade Policy Review process. TPR government reports for Samoa and PNG were finalised, submitted to the WTO Secretariat, and published on the WTO website.

PIF Geneva coordinated assistance by the consultants supporting the Pacific Group through the Trade Advocacy Fund (TAF). Under output 3 (technical advice), written briefings were provided on investment facilitation, trade and the environment, e-commerce, and WTO reform (responding to communications from the US and India/China). In the area of fisheries, TAF consultants assisted the Pacific Group at clusters of meetings, bilateral and informal meeting and provided intersessional (between clusters) analysis.

In February 2018 the tender process for the preparation of an e-Commerce Readiness Assessment for Tonga was officially launched.

Work continued on the Pacific Quality Infrastructure Project, whose Concept Note was finalised and is attached at Annex 1.

3.1.2 Completed/Secured

The Office helped Solomon Islands to secure assistance from the Trade Facilitation Support Program of the World Bank, notably to support the development of a Single Window system.

3.1.3 Ongoing

PIF Geneva facilitated a formal submission by Solomon Island to the Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation (GATF).

Dialogue with Trade Advocacy Fund advanced on the possibly of expanding the project supporting the Pacific Group on WTO negotiations.

The three TradeCom project proposals submitted by FICs with support from PIF-GVA were prioritised by the TradeCom Project Management Unit, but are still to be assessed by the EU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER</th>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>IN SUPPORT OF</th>
<th>STAGE*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TradeCom</td>
<td>Trade Policy and sub-regional FTAs</td>
<td>FSM</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TradeCom</td>
<td>SPS Framework</td>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TradeCom</td>
<td>Export Strategy</td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ‘Stage’ refers to the type of action within the project cycle that the Geneva Office is currently supporting, with: (1) Collection/Dissemination = initial engagement with partners and members to scope interest and feasibility; (2) Identification = High-level conceptualisation of possible project; (3) Formulation = detailed work on project proposals

3.2. Apply! Demand-driven Aid-for-Trade facilities accepting applications

(1) TradeCom II (2) Trade Advocacy Fund II (3) Standards Trade and Development Facility (4) Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation (5) Fit for Market (6) SIDLEY Emerging Enterprises
# PROJECT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project title</strong></th>
<th>Quality Infrastructure in the Pacific Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sponsoring Partners** | Australia, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)  
European Union, TradeCom II Program  
Germany, Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB) |
| **Key Implementing partners** | Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)  
CARICOM Regional Organisation for Standards and Quality (CROSQ)  
Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB) |
| **Project duration** | 9 months |
| **Rational** | Pacific policy-makers and private sector stakeholders are faced with quality-related issues on a daily basis. These include meeting quality requirements demanded by overseas buyers/markets and ensuring that fit-for-purpose quality requirements are adopted and enforced in the domestic market. Failure to meet quality requirements undermines Forum Islands Countries (FICs) export competitiveness and the ability of Pacific people to enjoy a healthy and safe life, protect the natural environment and its resources, withstand natural disasters, and guarantee a fair treatment to consumers.  
To address these issues, the project aims at strengthening the Quality Infrastructure Systems in the Pacific.  
Quality Infrastructure is the totality of the institutional framework (public and private) needed to provide acceptable evidence that products and services meet defined requirements. Quality Infrastructure Systems include (1) quality-related policy, legislation and regulations (2) metrology systems (3) standardization systems (4) accreditation systems; and (5) conformity assessment systems (testing, inspection, and certification). For the purpose of this project, quality promotion is included as the sixth component of a Quality Infrastructure System.  
By ensuring compliance with overseas requirements, the project will Promote Economic Prosperity through trade. By ensuring strengthening of and compliance with domestic requirements the project will Promote People Centered Development through enhanced fairness, safety, and security.  
A well-designed Quality Infrastructure System is central to support the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 (economic growth) and 9 (industrialization), as well as a number of other SDGs – 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. |
| **Objective of the project (Impact)** | Promote Economic Prosperity and People Centered Development |
| **Specific Objectives (Outcomes)** | • Ensuring that goods and services produced by FICs meet the quality requirements demanded by overseas authorities or the marketplace  
• Ensuring that adequate quality requirements are in place in FICs |
- Ensuring that goods and services produced by FICs or imported from overseas meet the quality requirements demanded by domestic authorities or the marketplace
- Ensuring compliance of FICs’ exports to facilitate market access under regional trade agreements (MSGTA, PICTA, PACER Plus, EPA) and enhance regional economic integration

| Activities for Phase 1 | • Prepare Quality Infrastructure awareness and capacity-building material  
• Assess of the state of play of Quality Infrastructure in the Pacific  
• Organise a regional Quality Infrastructure workshop to:  
  o Sensitise Pacific stakeholders about the importance and functioning of Quality Infrastructure Systems, secure ownership and motivate change  
  o Understand how Quality Infrastructure issues are embedded in relevant trade agreements  
  o Validate an assessment on the state of play of Quality Infrastructure in the Pacific  
  o Envision the future and prepare a Regional Statement on Quality Infrastructure  
  o Provide an overview of existing technical assistance programs on Quality Infrastructure  
  o Secure commitment by donor partners to support the agreed way forward |

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

1. Quality Infrastructure Systems

Quality Infrastructure is the totality of the institutional framework (public and private) needed to provide acceptable evidence that products and services meet defined requirements. These requirements are either specified on a mandatory basis (for example in the form of technical regulations) or on a voluntary basis through standards, to meet the demands of the market place.¹

The set of requirements relevant to Quality Infrastructure Systems go beyond the area of trade, to embrace consumer protection, safety and quality of food, industrial and consumer goods and services, safety and quality of regulated services (public utilities), natural resource management, environment and climate change, fair competition etc.

In the trade area, sound Quality Infrastructure Systems guarantee access to overseas markets for goods and services (including tourism). In the same way, well-functioning Quality Infrastructure Systems ensure that foreign products and services meeting defined requirements have easy access to the domestic market. From this viewpoint, Quality Infrastructure Systems are a key component of trade facilitation, together with Customs and Biosecurity systems. Conversely, poor Quality Infrastructure Systems tend to result in what is known as Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT).

Beyond trade, robust Quality Infrastructure Systems guarantee, for example, that the food we consume is healthy and sustainably sourced; that our home appliances are safe and energy-efficient; that the working environment is secure; that electrical, water, and gas systems are safe; that our buildings can withstand the consequences of climate change; that our governments can effectively respond to natural disasters; that our natural resources are managed responsibly; that the environment is protected; and so on.

¹ UNIDO (2017a)
By providing the above services, robust Quality Infrastructure Systems increase economic prosperity and promote people-centered development.

The five components of a Quality Infrastructure System include (1) quality-related policy, legislation and regulations (2) metrology systems (3) standardization systems (4) accreditation systems; and (5) conformity assessment systems (testing, inspection, and certification).

Sometimes, other components are included in the definition of Quality Infrastructure Systems, for example: quality promotion (information, awareness, education); and systems of interaction between market and consumers.

Quality promotion is very important in the developing world because it stimulates both the supply of quality by the industry, and demand for quality from industry by consumers who have traditionally settled on price-based purchasing rather than complementing the same with quality-based purchasing. For the purpose of this project quality promotion is therefore included as the sixth component of Quality Infrastructure Systems.

In order for a country or a region to create the right incentives for quality goods and services, it is important that its Quality Infrastructure System meets international best practices and that quality conscious behaviour is promoted in society. When goods and services are traded across borders, it is also important that these practices are recognized by key trading partners. International recognition is facilitated by mechanisms put in place by global Quality Infrastructure bodies.

Pacific policy-makers and private sector stakeholders are faced with quality issues on a daily basis. However, the inability of Forum Islands Countries (FICs) to adopt a holistic approach to Quality Infrastructure has sometimes resulted in piecemeal solutions that have undermined the chances of promoting quality. At the same time, failure to appreciate the opportunities provided by regional cooperation and integration in the area of Quality Infrastructure have sometimes made those solutions economically unsustainable.

The development of regional approaches to Quality Infrastructure has already demonstrated its potential to deliver substantial development benefits for Small Islands Developing States (SIDS). For example, the CARICOM Regional Organization for Standards and Quality (CROSQ) has over the years played a leading role in facilitating the development of regional standards, promote the harmonization of metrology systems and support the sustainable production and trade of goods and services in the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME).

A well-designed Quality Infrastructure System would be central to support the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8 (economic growth) and 9 (industrialization), as well as of several other SDGs – 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.

2 Previous Work on Pacific Quality Infrastructure

Quality Infrastructure is not new to the Pacific. In 2005, the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) sponsored a major study on Quality Infrastructure. The five-volume study assessed the status of the Quality Infrastructure components in FICs, noted very significant gaps in all the assessed dimensions, and recommended options to enhance the system, including through priority national and regional activities.

Key gaps identified in the 2005 Quality Infrastructure study include:

- **Legislation.** Core Quality Infrastructure legislation is missing in most FICs
- **Standards.** Only Fiji and PNG have internationally recognized standards setting mechanisms and standards bodies

---

2 CROSQ, INDOCAL, and PTB (2017)
3 UNIDO (2016a), and UNIDO (2016b)
4 Forum Island Countries are the developing country members of the Pacific Islands Forum. These include: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Nauru, New Caledonia, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu
6 KVA Consult Ltd (2005a), KVA Consult Ltd (2005b), CaSServ (2005a), CaSServ (2005b), and CaSServ (2005c)
7 A Vanuatu Bureau of Standards (VBS) was established in December 2016
• **Metrology.** Fiji, PNG and Tonga are the only 3 FICs with established metrology systems – which, however, require modernization

• **Accreditation.** Only PNG has a formal regional accreditation body for laboratories.\(^8\)

• **Conformity Assessment.** Almost none of the laboratories in FICs is either internationally or regionally accredited. There are very few internationally certified companies, mostly in Fiji and PNG

• **Knowledge and awareness** of QI issues is found to be generally scarce in the region resulting in no national focus on them

On options to enhance the system, the 2005 study defined an ambitious agenda of Regional Economic Cooperation (REC) and Integration (REI), including by indicating national entities suitable to assume regional mandates, proposing the establishment of new regional bodies, identifying areas for harmonization of national practices, and for sharing and pooling of strategic national resources. Key recommendations of the 2005 Quality Infrastructure Study include, but are not limited to:

• Review of Quality Infrastructure legislative and regulatory process

• Review of legislative and regulatory provisions in quality-related areas (import, export, consumer protection, public utilities, agriculture and industrial products, safety, environment and climate change)

• Model legislation on core Quality Infrastructure (metrology, standards, accreditation)

• Establishment of a Regional Standards Resource Centre

• Establishment of a Regional Consultative Committee on Standards

• National Primary Standards (metrology) in Fiji and PNG to be designated as Regional Standards with traceability to International Standards

• Establishment of a Pacific Islands Metrology Forum (PIFM)\(^9\)

• Designation of one Regional Testing Laboratory (with international accreditation) to complement designated National Testing Laboratories (with at least regional accreditation)

• Regional Calibration Laboratory to be included as part of the Regional Testing Laboratory

• Establishment of a Forum Islands Countries Conformity and Metrology Institute (FIC-CAMI) coordinating development of regional certification initiatives

• Establishment of a FIC Laboratory Accreditation Service (FIC-LAS) for international accreditation of laboratories and inspection bodies. Potential for PNG-LAS to be designated as FIC-LAS

• Bring FICs under the umbrella of the Joint-Accreditation System – Australia New Zealand (JAS-ANZ) for international accreditation of certification and inspection bodies

• Entrust FIC-CAMI with regional accreditation of testing, certification, and inspection bodies

• Entrust FIC-CAMI with other key Quality Infrastructure functions at regional level (maintenance of Regional Directory of Legal Metrology, act as PIMF secretariat, provision of certain certification and inspection services, provision of training, etc.) and provide for mutual recognition of FIC-CAMI certification and accreditation services through appropriate legal instruments

Recommendations of the study, which are reported in full at Annex 1, converged in indicating the PIFS as the ideal coordinating body for the efforts to enhance Quality Infrastructure by virtue of the Secretariat’s mandate on trade-related matters – i.e. one of the areas most affected by Quality Infrastructures Systems. Besides

---

\(^8\) The body’s international accreditation was suspended in 2017

\(^9\) The 2005 study gives metrology-related responsibilities to two different bodies, namely the Pacific Islands Metrology Forum (PIFM), and the Forum Islands Countries Conformity and Metrology Institute (FIC-CAMI). According to the report, the PIMF would be comprised of representatives of the national metrology authorities and play a role in harmonising metrology standards. On the other hand, the FIC-CAMI would be entrusted to provide metrology services to the FICs.
coordination of the overall initiative, the study proposed PIFS as leading implementing entity in the area of quality-related policy, legislation and regulations.

Whilst recommendations of the 2005 Quality Infrastructure study were noted by Forum Trade Ministers, no substantial follow-up took place to implement the recommended actions. A number of possible reasons can explain the lack of significant engagement on Quality Infrastructure issues back in 2005:

- Trade in goods was dominated by unprocessed commodities - for which quality considerations are relatively less important
- Small contribution of trade in services, including tourism services
- Emphasis on import substitution as a pathway to industrialization
- Lower attention of foreign and domestic consumers to quality-related considerations when purchasing goods and services
- Absence of Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) covering a significant share of FICs’ trade and creating an incentive to harmonize quality regimes across the Pacific region

Major trends have been observed during past 13 years, which justify PIFS’ re-engagement on Quality Infrastructure. These include:

- Shift in FICs’ national trade policies towards export-led growth, with an emphasis on value-addition and product/market diversification to pursue industrialization
- Emergence of FIC entrepreneurs who are successfully exporting or targeting high-quality goods including in the sectors of essential oils, food (including organic), beverages, beauty products, high-end seafood, certified forestry products, etc.
- Trade in “quality-dependent” services, including tourism services, is now providing a significant contribution to the FICs’ economies
- Overseas buyers of FIC products (consumers and firms) are now very sensitive to quality considerations across many dimensions (sustainability, fairness, organic production, etc.)
- Quality considerations, notably related to health, safety, and the environment, are increasingly felt as important by FIC consumers
- The scope of existing FTAs (for example the MSG-FTA) has expanded. Crucially, negotiations on the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations Plus (PACER Plus) are now concluded, thus creating a platform which can potentially cover the majority of FICs and incentivize harmonization of quality regimes \[^{10}\]
- The adverse consequences of climate change and the increased intensity of natural disasters indicate new dimensions of Quality Infrastructure Systems that governments are increasingly keen to prioritize

3. State of play in FICs

The status of the Pacific Quality Infrastructure’s legal and institutional framework does not seem to have evolved significantly during the past 13 years.

Institutions. At FIC level, Quality Infrastructure bodies have been in place for a long time in PNG and Fiji. In the former, the National Institute of Standards and Industrial Technology (NISIT) was established under NISIT Act 1993. Its functions cover technical standards, metrology, conformity assessment schemes (some certification initiatives), and laboratory accreditation (PNG Laboratory Accreditation Scheme, PNGLAS). NISIT is a corresponding member of the International Standards Organization (ISO) and of the International Organization for Legal Metrology (OIML), and a member of the Pacific Area Standards Congress (PASC), the Asia Pacific Metrology Programme (APMP), and the Asia-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum (APLMF). Accreditiation of NISIT’s

\[^{10}\] The PACER Plus Chapter and Work Program on Technical Regulations, Standards and Conformity Assessment Procedures does indeed provide important elements for the development of a Quality Infrastructure System in the Pacific. See Pacific Islands Forum (2017a), and Pacific Islands Forum (2017b).
PNG-LAS with the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) was suspended on 24 August 2017.\(^\text{11}\)

In Fiji, the Department of National Trade Measurement & Standards (DNTMS) was established in 1957. Its functions cover metrology and technical standards. The DNTMS is a corresponding member of the ISO and of the OIML. It is also affiliated to the PASC, and is a member of the APMP.

In December 2016 a Bill for the Vanuatu Bureau of Standards (VBS) was approved by the Vanuatu Parliament. The VBS’ functions are defined in the VBS Act to include technical standards, metrology, and conformity assessment.

**Policy and Legislation.** The on-line Pacific Islands Legal Information Institute (PACLI) database\(^\text{12}\) reveals that Weights & Measures Act are only available in Tonga, Solomon Islands, Nauru, Kiribati and PNG. Standards Acts are only found in PNG, Fiji, and Vanuatu.

In 2017, with assistance from the EU TBT Program, Kiribati launched its National Quality Policy which for the first time proposed a holistic approach to QI issues in the country.\(^\text{13}\) Metrology was then prioritised as an area of national importance and with support from the Kiribati Enhanced Integrated Framework Project, the Government of Kiribati conducted a Capacity Needs Assessment of the National Metrology Infrastructure. This was complemented by an in-depth analysis of the *Weights and Measures Act*, 1984 and the development of a Metrology Bill to repeal and replace the *Weights and Measures Act*, 1984.

The absence of major QI developments in FICs, coupled with the trends observed in the previous section, explain why in a recent Aid-for-Trade study by the University of Adelaide,\(^\text{14}\) capacity-building to address non-tariff barriers to trade (Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards (SPS) and Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT)) scored as one of the top-three capacity-building priorities for FICs to benefit from PACER Plus. As noted by the University of Adelaide, “the need for capacity building in respect of technical regulations, standards, and conformity assessment procedures was identified for all FICs”. Building on recommendations from the University of Adelaide (2016), the Implementing Arrangement for Development and Economic Cooperation under the PACER Plus\(^\text{15}\) has included the following indicative activities:

**SPS-related**
- Capacity building on developing and enforcing export certification systems;
- Technical assistance to improve industry compliance with export certification systems;
- Assistance to establish or strengthen capacity to manage sanitary and phytosanitary risks including food safety

**TBT-related**
- Assistance in the adoption and application of technical regulations, standards and conformity assessment procedures;
- Assistance to improve technical analysis, product testing and certification (including organic certification) of local products to ensure that they meet international standards;
- Support for relevant central institutions in negotiating and implementing regulatory cooperation agreements with respect to technical regulations, standards and the results of conformity assessment procedures.

The Implementing Arrangement for Development and Economic Cooperation, which will be rolled-out upon entry into force of the PACER Plus, can provide important resources to strengthen Quality Infrastructure in the Pacific. Between now and then, it is important that updated knowledge is gathered about the status of FICs’

---

\(^{11}\) See http://ilac.org/signatory-detail/?id=51

\(^{12}\) See http://www.paclii.org/

\(^{13}\) http://www.acp-eu-tbt.org/

\(^{14}\) University of Adelaide (2016)

\(^{15}\) Pacific Islands Forum (2017b)
Quality Infrastructure Systems, that Quality Infrastructure is prioritized at regional level, and that that a high-level agreement is reached about which regional actions should be undertaken to strengthen those systems. Updated knowledge and clear identification of QI priorities will also serve the purpose of mobilizing additional resources from interested donor partners and the private sector.

This project presents complementarities with initiatives assisting selected industries to gain international market access, for example the Pacific Horticultural and Agricultural Market Access Program (PHAMA).

**OVERALL OBJECTIVE (IMPACT)**

Promote Economic Prosperity and People Centered Development

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE (OUTCOME)**

Promote quality in the Pacific by:

- Ensuring that goods and services produced by FICs meet the quality requirements demanded by overseas authorities or the marketplace
- Ensuring that adequate quality requirements are in place in FICs
- Ensuring that goods and services produced by FICs or imported from overseas meet the quality requirements demanded by domestic authorities or the marketplace
- Ensuring compliance of FICs’ exports to facilitate market access under regional trade agreements (MSGTA, PICTA, PACER Plus, EPA) and enhance regional economic integration

By ensuring compliance with overseas requirements, the project will Promote Economic Prosperity through trade. By ensuring strengthening of and compliance with domestic requirements the project will Promote People Centered Development through enhanced fairness, safety, and security

**ACTIVITIES FOR PHASE 1**

The project will be implemented over a 12-month period, starting in January 2019

Pacific Quality Infrastructure Systems can only be strengthened if FICs come to fully understand their components and role, identify key gaps, and agree to address those gaps through coordinated action. Therefore, the project will be articulated as follows:

1. **Prepare Quality Infrastructure Awareness and Capacity-Building Material.** Simple capacity-building material will be produced to sensitize participants in advance of the Quality Infrastructure Workshop. Capacity-building material would include:

   - Overview of Quality Infrastructure (QI) Systems and their role
   - Overview of Quality Infrastructure institutions and services relevant to the Pacific
   - QI-related development opportunities and impacts for FICs, based on the Pacific context and experiences from other ACP regions, including the Caribbean and Africa

   An international expert will be mobilized by the EU TradeCom facility to undertake this activity. The expert will conduct the activity partly at home (desk-review) and partly in the Pacific, including through conduct of consultations. The expert may reference the UNIDO approach for this activity, which was piloted this on the occasion of its Quality Infrastructure Trading Program in the Caribbean, with good results in terms of client’s satisfaction. CROSQ, the TradeCom project’s beneficiary, will be consulted on the development of this material via remote means, together with other initiatives’ partners.

2. **Assess of the state of play of Quality Infrastructure in the Pacific.** A questionnaire will be prepared by the Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB) and administered to FICs to assess the state of play of QI in the Pacific. Responses from FICs will be consolidated by the PTB, and integrated with the findings of

---

16 UNIDO (20017b)
interviews which will be conducted remotely by an international expert. Finding of the PTB assessment will be circulated in advance of the regional QI workshop.

3. **Organize a regional Quality Infrastructure Workshop.** Efforts of the previous two activities will culminate in a week-long Quality Infrastructure workshop to be organized in Suva, Fiji. Funded participants will include:

- Three Senior Officials for each FIC, for a total of 48 participants. Senior delegates will be selected in representation of the entities that are more linked to the development of Quality Infrastructure Systems, such as: (1) Ministry responsible for Agriculture; (2) Ministry responsible for Trade and Industry; (3) Apex private sector organization - normally, Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- FICs’ institutions that can play a role in the strengthening of a Pacific Quality Infrastructure System. These include head of the Fiji’s Department of Trade Measurements and Standards (DTMS), PNG National Institute of Standards and Industrial Technology (NISIT) and Vanuatu Bureau of Standards (VBS), for a total of 3 participants
- 1 representative from CROSQ
- 1 representative from the African Association for Standardization (ARSO)
- 1 representative from PTB

Representatives from other organizations will be invited to attend on a self-funded basis, however, some resources could be made available to support participation of financially constrained partners. Key organizations have been tentatively identified and are detailed in Annex 2. These include:

- Representatives from donor partners
- Representatives from Quality Infrastructure Institutions Pacific Islands Forum’s developed country members
- Representatives from regional Quality Infrastructure Institutions (Asia-Pacific region)
- Representative from global Quality Infrastructure Institutions
- Selected UN Funds, Programs, Specialized Agencies and UN-related organizations active in the Quality Infrastructure area

The objectives of the regional QI workshop are to:

- **Sensitise Pacific stakeholders about the importance and functioning of Quality Infrastructure Systems, secure ownership and motivate change (2 days).** This part of the workshop will be led by the TradeCom expert. By the end of this part participants would have developed a holistic view of (1) what is meant by Quality Infrastructure; (2) what are its components and how these interact; (3) how are the different levels of a Quality Infrastructure System (national, regional, international) organized, with particular emphasis on the Asia-Pacific region; and (4) what are the development impacts of robust Quality Infrastructure Systems here, goods practices by developing partners of the initiative such as CROSQ, ARSO, DMTS, NISIT, and VBS will be shared (5)
- **Understand how Quality Infrastructure issues are embedded in relevant trade agreements (0.5 days).** Trade agreements (sub-regional, regional, and multilateral) that FICs are parties or signatories to include provisions on Quality Infrastructure. These provisions establish mechanisms to facilitate trade, but FICs may need additional capacity to effectively utilise them. This part of the workshop will assess how QI issues are embedded in key trade agreements, and what capacity is required to make QI provisions genuine tools for trade development
- **Validate an assessment on the state of play of Quality Infrastructure in the Pacific (1 day).** Findings of the PTB assessment will be presented at the workshop. Country presentations will
also be given by participants, which will complement the findings of the PTB survey. Major gaps to the establishment of an effective Pacific QI system will be identified, with particular focus on common gaps that can effectively be tackled by regional activities

- Provide an overview of existing technical assistance on Quality Infrastructure (0.5 days). Agencies with a sound track-record in the provision of technical assistance in the area of Quality Infrastructure will be invited to outline their programs, including impact produced on beneficiaries, and relevance to the priorities identified by FICs

- Envision the future and prepare a Regional Statement on Quality Infrastructure (0.5 days). Drawing upon the findings of the previous sessions, participants will be tasked to agree on a vision for the Pacific Quality Infrastructure System and to identify and agree high-level priority actions to achieve that vision. This vision and these actions will be embedded in a Regional Quality Infrastructure Statement charting the way forward for the initiative

- Secure commitment by donor partners to support the agreed way forward (0.5 days). Donor partners will be invited to present existing funding opportunities on QI, and to pledge support towards the subsequent phases of the Pacific Quality Infrastructure project, which will focus on implementing priority actions of the Regional QI Statement

ACTIVITIES FOR SUBSEQUENT PHASES

These will be draw upon the Regional QI Statement, with implementation linked to available resources

EXPECTED OUTPUTS

- Awareness about the value of Quality Infrastructure embedded
- Capacity of target FICs stakeholders on Quality Infrastructure Systems built
- State of play of Quality Infrastructure assessed, and key gaps identified
- Vision for the Pacific Quality Infrastructure System formed and priority actions to address the identified gaps and achieve the vision agreed
- Regional and international partnerships for technical cooperation/assistance on Quality Infrastructure established
- Support to subsequent phases of the Pacific Quality Infrastructure project pledged

COMPLEMENTARY INITIATIVES – BSI TRAINING

The British Standards Institute is planning to undertake a training on standards for Pacific Islands Countries and is proposing the training to be held back to back with the Pacific Quality Infrastructure Workshop. The BSI training is tentatively planned for 3-7 June and will cover the following topics

1. The trade environment
2. The regulatory environment.
3. Standards: policy tool or trade barrier?
4. Standards: Practical implementation to support regulation.
5. The economic benefits of standards
6. Standards and regulation and the WTO (key disciplines)
7. Standards development and use
8. Key issues and challenges
9. NSB Strategy
| 10. Scenarios: How to resolve trade issues related to standards and regulations. |
| 11. Transparency |
| 12. Mechanisms for settling trade problems |
| 13. National Quality Infrastructure |
| 14. Stakeholder outreach |
# ANNEX 1

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2005 STUDIES ON STANDARDS AND CONFORMANCE INFRASTRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Legislative and Regulatory Framework - L</th>
<th>Standard Bodies - S</th>
<th>Metrology Framework - M</th>
<th>Conformity Assessment (Testing, Inspection, Certification) - C</th>
<th>Accreditation - A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USD 320,000* (1 year)</td>
<td>USD 760,000-2,215,000* (5 years)</td>
<td>USD 1,165,000* (7 years)</td>
<td>USD 850,000* (7 years)</td>
<td>USD 850,000* (7 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ESTABLISHING POLICIES AND PRIORITIES</td>
<td>That FICs acknowledge the need to establish national standards and make commitments towards considering standards that are of priority to them, particularly food standards</td>
<td>NEEDS AND PRIORITIES To identify needs and assist in setting priorities for the development of the national metrology system each FIC should conduct a basic survey of the current and future use of measurement in their economy and identify the economic and social benefits</td>
<td>TESTING Each FIC should designate a national testing laboratory, responsible for all tests on behalf of all government agencies in that country. In doing this, governments should take action as soon as possible to amalgamate fragmented testing services. The national testing laboratory should also be available to the private sector on a fee-for-service basis</td>
<td>NEED FOR ACCREDITATION The Pacific Island Forum (PIF) should endorse the principle that accreditation of bodies that provide certification, testing and inspection services provides confidence in the products and services provided by organizations that are certified, tested or inspected by such bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>That FIC governments be encouraged to put in place regulations that focus on outcomes and enforcement processes and to use internationally-recognized Standards for the technical</td>
<td>All FICs should develop their own system for undertaking local stakeholder consultation and their own Council for the final adoption of national standards at a time and pace that suits</td>
<td>METROLOGY RESOURCES AND CAPABILITIES Governments of the FIC’s should commit to enacting modern and harmonized metrology legislation and administration in the Pacific to facilitate trade in</td>
<td>Where appropriate, the national testing laboratory may have facilities (sites) located away from the main laboratory. In this case, all such facilities should form part of the</td>
<td>Member countries of the PIF should enter into agreements with each accreditation body or bodies set up or designated to provide accreditation in the FICs to recognize them as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifications required to achieve regulatory objectives. Adoption of similar Standards on a regional basis will encourage harmonisation and facilitate trade while leaving legislation and associated regulations as a sovereign matter.</td>
<td>their level of development. See Recommendation L14</td>
<td>the region. This should include the necessary administrative systems to ensure that the legislation is complied with, and should provide a sound evidential basis for measurements if they are used for legal purposes (e.g. trade measurement, government regulation, and in commercial contracts). See Recommendation L15</td>
<td>designated national testing laboratory</td>
<td>national provider of accreditation in their field of activity. See also Recommendation A14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That consultations be held with each FIC to determine regional and national priorities and that a work programme be developed to address technical legislation and regulations in line with identified trade and economic development needs. This work programme will be implemented by legal advisers attached to the PIFS (see Recommendation L7)</td>
<td>The development and approval of the technical content of standards used in the region should be undertaken at the national level with support from a central resource</td>
<td>To ensure consistency of measurement all FICs should maintain standards of measurement appropriate to their needs. These may include standards of mass, length, volume, temperature, time and electrical quantities</td>
<td>Small FICs with limited resources should consider designating a suitable laboratory in a neighbouring FIC as their national testing laboratory. Alternatively, several small countries may combine resources to establish a suitable facility (e.g. the northern FICs)</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF ACCREDITATION OF TESTING AND CALIBRATION BODIES PIFS should set up the FICs Laboratory Accreditation Service (FIC-LAS) with the view to becoming self-funding after seven years, and to achieve international recognition with International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) by 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That FIC governments and regulators give urgent consideration to how enforcement of A Central Standards Resource Centre should be developed to support the National primary standards in PNG and Fiji could be designated as Regional Pacific Standards and, by At least one laboratory in the FICs needs to be designated as the regional testing facility. This</td>
<td>PIFS should consider the possibility of converting the most advanced laboratory accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations might be improved, particularly those relating to exported products, in order to increase confidence among trading partners of the credibility and reliability of the regulatory regime and associated conformance activities in individual FICs</td>
<td>creation of standards in the FICs</td>
<td>maintaining traceability to international standards, ensure the acceptance of Pacific measurements in overseas markets</td>
<td>regional laboratory should conduct tests that are complex and beyond the capacity of national laboratories, or are performed so rarely that the national laboratories will not have the equipment or skills to adequately perform the tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 That any legislation or regulations with S&amp;C implications be consistent with WTO requirements, specifically the TBT and SPS Agreements, and with accepted international practice. This will be particularly important in A new FIC Consultative Committee on Standards and Conformity should be formed and meet on an annual basis to discuss standards and conformance matters</td>
<td>Primary standards of measurement within the FIC should be inter-compared with regional primary standards and through them to international standards to ensure their acceptance in international markets (i.e. the regional testing facility should, as soon as practicable, become accredited at the international recognition level for all applicable tests. See Recommendations A3 to A5.</td>
<td>The regional testing facility should, as soon as practicable, become accredited at the international recognition level for all applicable tests. See Recommendations A3 to A5.</td>
<td>FIC-LAS, once formed, should negotiate with any other provider of laboratory accreditation services in the FICs for transfer of laboratory accreditation undertaken in any FIC to FIC-LAS. This should be achieved within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body (PNGLAS) into an internationally recognized accreditation service for the FICs. Since the most advanced laboratory accreditation body is the PNG Laboratory Accreditation Service (PNGLAS), its conversion to be the FIC-LAS could be achieved by either: a) FIC-LAS remaining within NISIT (PNG) and entering into agreements with all FICs confirming its regional role and involving representation of the FICs in an advisory way in FIC-LAS; or b) FIC-LAS to become a separate body owned by the PIFS with representation on the governing board by the FICs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>areas where there is potential for mutual recognition</td>
<td>FIC standards should have traceability back to international standards)</td>
<td>12 months of attainment of international recognition of FIC-LAS by ILAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>That top priority be given to establishing a legal basis in each FIC for an S&amp;C infrastructure. See Recommendations L14 to L16</td>
<td>To ensure the sustainability of the metrology system all measurement services provided to industry and commerce should aim to have recurrent costs recoverable through charging for calibration and testing services. This could be phased in over a seven-year period. Initial set-up (capital) costs should be directly funded through the PIFS (or the FICs) or through bilateral development assistance grants</td>
<td>Designated national testing laboratories should work towards the level of accreditation appropriate to the host country and the items being tested. In most cases this will be at the regional recognition level. See Recommendations A10 and A12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CAPACITY BUILDING That two Parliamentary Counsel with experience in drafting technical legislation and regulations be attached to the Legal Drafting Assistance section of the PIFS Political and</td>
<td>NATIONAL COORDINATION OF THE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM Co-ordination of government measurement facilities, staff and resources should be implemented by the</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF ACCREDITATION OF SYSTEMS, PRODUCT AND PERSONNEL CERTIFICATION BODIES The PIF should negotiate with the Australian and New Zealand governments to bring the FICs under the umbrella of the international treaty that defines the roles and responsibilities of Joint Accreditation System – Australia New Zealand (JAS-ANZ). This would include the appointment of one or two FIC representatives to the JAS-ANZ Governing Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private laboratories can, and should co-exist with designated national testing laboratories. Accreditation should be at a level dictated by commercial and legal requirements</td>
<td>After operation of the arrangement with JAS-ANZ for seven years, the PIF should undertake a review of accreditation in the FICs to determine if the setting up of a new FIC regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs Division to provide legal advice and support to national law drafters in developing new, or reviewing and updating existing, legislation or regulations that call up measurement, Standards, accreditation and conformity assessment activities (S&amp;C). Terms of reference for these advisers, including commissioning of technical expertise as required, are outlined in the Legislative and Regulatory Framework Report.</td>
<td><strong>national metrology authority as soon as practicable in each FIC</strong> in order to provide cost effective systems and better use of scarce resources. Where no metrology system currently exists, governments should nominate or appoint an official with appropriate technical or scientific expertise to co-ordinate the development of the metrology system.</td>
<td>accreditation body is viable and sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **8** | That template laws and regulations be developed for specified priority areas and that these be made available to each FIC, using a process similar to that used by the SPC for the template Biosecurity Act, with a range of assistance options:  
- undertaking own review and amending existing legislation and associated regulations, | **REGIONAL CO-OPERATION** A Pacific Island Metrology Forum (PIMF) should be established. This should comprise metrology authorities of the member states of the Pacific Island Forum. The objectives of the PIMF should be: harmonization of metrology requirements in the Pacific; information exchange between the members, sharing | A regional calibration laboratory should be established as part of the regional testing facility. This is separate from the calibration required for metrology associated with trade weights and measures. See Recommendations A10 and M8. |

|  |  | **INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF ACCREDITATION OF INSPECTION BODIES** The PIFS, when setting up FIC-LAS (see Recommendations A3 to A5), should ensure that FIC-LAS is structured so that it can provide for accreditation of inspection bodies and that it pursues international recognition of this accreditation. |  |
using the template as guidance
• reviewing and updating existing legislation with support from S&C legal advisers requesting the S&C legal advisers to draft national legislation and regulations on their behalf
• a mix of all of the above

solutions to developing problems; and developing cost effective solutions to changes caused by new technologies, changes in the market place, changing government policies and globalization. The PIMF should request recognition by PIF as a specialist regional body and report through the PIF. The long term (7–10 years) objective for the PIMF should be to affiliate with Asia-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum (APLMF) and Asia-Pacific Metrology Program (APMP)

service from ILAC as soon as possible

9 That regional workshops be held on the operation of WTO TBT and SPS Enquiry Points and on leveraging the information available on the regulatory requirements in overseas markets to benefit exporters

A Directory of Legal Metrology in the Pacific Islands should be produced to assist harmonization and improve understanding by government officials and industry in the region of facilities, capabilities, legislation and administrative structures and national requirements

All testing laboratories, irrespective of their accreditation, should regularly calibrate their measuring instruments. Calibration should cover the common measurements including mass, volume, pressure, and temperature

The PIF, when negotiating for JAS-ANZ to provide accreditation services for certification bodies (see Recommendations A6 and A7), should include the possibility of JAS-ANZ providing accreditation of inspection bodies and that JAS-ANZ pursues international recognition of this accreditation service from IAF as soon as possible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>GOOD REGULATORY PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That FICs be encouraged to apply Good Regulatory Practice (GRP) principles to the development of new regulations, including undertaking cost/benefit analyses and preparing Regulatory Impact Statements, and that training be provided as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Pacific metrology training program should be developed by the PIMF or the FIC-CAMI (see Recommendation A10). This training program would initially focus on developing basic capabilities but could also address the use of electronic and computer technologies and high capacity measurements used in the collection of excises, export of commodities, and agricultural and industrial production. Training material developed by the APLMF could be used in this program, particularly the approval and verification of weighing instruments and fuel dispensers, high capacity weighing and flow measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private certification bodies, accredited at the international recognition level, should continue to operate in the FICs. Governments should advise users to check that the accreditation scope of a chosen certification body (and hence its international recognition) extends to the certification service offered and the geographic region it is offered in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL AND REGIONAL RECOGNITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PIF should establish a new facility, possibly designated as the FIC Conformance and Metrology Institute (FIC-CAMI), to drive the implementation of a standards and conformance framework within the FICs. Its functions should include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional coordination of the conformance infrastructure (including metrology, accreditation, and certification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional accreditation of testing and calibration laboratories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional accreditation of systems, product and personnel certification bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional accreditation of inspection bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operating as the Secretariat for the PIMF. See Recommendation M8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Responsible for the Regional FIC Metrology Standards, although these could be located at separate laboratories (e.g. PNG, Fiji). See Recommendation M6

• Provision of calibration services to FICs for both their National metrology standards and, where required, for trade metrology.


• Where no other suitable service is available in the FICs, provision of certification services for systems, products and personnel. See Recommendation C11

• Where no other suitable service is available in the FICs, provision of inspection
That any FIC that is a member of the WTO, or aspiring to become a member, ensures that any new regulation that impacts on trade is notified to the WTO as required under the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS). See Recommendation M10.

Subject to acceptance of Recommendations M1 to M10, the PIF should put in place a seven-year implementation plan commencing in 2006 that will involve additional funding of approximately FJD 2.37 million over seven years.

Governments should actively work towards the mutual recognition of FIC-CAMI accreditation and standards and guides for the operation of regional certification bodies. These regional standards and guides will need to provide regional recognition of its accreditation bodies and certification services, within seven years recognizing that its metrology, training and information roles may need longer term financial support.

To enable the FIC-CAMI to provide regional accreditation and standards and guides for its operation as a regional accreditation body and for the operation of regional certification, testing and inspection bodies, these FIC-CAMI should be set up with the view of becoming self-funding, in respect of its regional accreditation and certification services, within seven years recognizing that its metrology, training and information roles may need longer term financial support.

BUDGET AND IMPLEMENTATION

Recommendation M10, the PIF should provide regional certification services (including HACCP), metrology, training and information services in support of its regional accreditation and certification services, recognizing that its metrology, training and information roles may need longer term financial support.

That any FIC that is a member of the WTO, or aspiring to become a member, ensures that any new regulation that impacts on trade is notified to the WTO as required under the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS). See Recommendation M10.

Subject to acceptance of Recommendations M1 to M10, the PIF should put in place a seven-year implementation plan commencing in 2006 that will involve additional funding of approximately FJD 2.37 million over seven years.

Governments should actively work towards the mutual recognition of FIC-CAMI accreditation and standards and guides for the operation of regional certification bodies. These regional standards and guides will need to provide regional recognition of its accreditation bodies and certification services, within seven years recognizing that its metrology, training and information roles may need longer term financial support.

To enable the FIC-CAMI to provide regional accreditation and standards and guides for its operation as a regional accreditation body and for the operation of regional certification, testing and inspection bodies, these FIC-CAMI should be set up with the view of becoming self-funding, in respect of its regional accreditation and certification services, within seven years recognizing that its metrology, training and information roles may need longer term financial support.

That any FIC that is a member of the WTO, or aspiring to become a member, ensures that any new regulation that impacts on trade is notified to the WTO as required under the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS). See Recommendation M10.

Subject to acceptance of Recommendations M1 to M10, the PIF should put in place a seven-year implementation plan commencing in 2006 that will involve additional funding of approximately FJD 2.37 million over seven years.

Governments should actively work towards the mutual recognition of FIC-CAMI accreditation and standards and guides for the operation of regional certification bodies. These regional standards and guides will need to provide regional recognition of its accreditation bodies and certification services, within seven years recognizing that its metrology, training and information roles may need longer term financial support.

To enable the FIC-CAMI to provide regional accreditation and standards and guides for its operation as a regional accreditation body and for the operation of regional certification, testing and inspection bodies, these FIC-CAMI should be set up with the view of becoming self-funding, in respect of its regional accreditation and certification services, within seven years recognizing that its metrology, training and information roles may need longer term financial support.
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>That any FIC that is a member of the WTO, or aspiring to become a member, ensures that it has operational TBT and SPS Enquiry Points and that exporters are aware of the market access information available through these Enquiry Points; and that training be provided if required</td>
<td>The proposed FIC-CAMI should evaluate all aspects of the implementation of HACCP certification currently in effect in the FICs; including standards used, competence of auditors, and assessment methods; make recommendations on the effectiveness of recognition of current HACCP certifications; and coordinate the adoption of any changes or improvements found to be necessary. See Recommendation A10</td>
<td>FIC-CAMI should be headquartered in a FIC other than that of the proposed FIC-LAS. The location needs to be in a FIC that has the capability of providing a stable environment. A possible location would be Samoa with some FIC-CAMI representatives being located in other sub-regions such as the northern FICs where there is a different standards and conformance heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>S&amp;C INFRASTRUCTURE</strong>&lt;br&gt;That each FIC has in place legislation formally recognizing a national system of measurement (International System of Units or SI), the provision of uniform measurement of physical quantities for national use and legal</td>
<td>The proposed FIC-CAMI should assist the development of the tourism industry within the FICs, by coordinating the development of certification programs for tourism operators to appropriate standards, and providing certification</td>
<td>FICs, within the scope of their regional free trade agreements, should recognize in their legislation and regulations the regional accreditation and certification activities of FIC-CAMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>That each FIC has in place legislation covering the recognition of national, regional and international Standards for use within its jurisdiction. This legislation should take account of the &quot;Code of Good Practice for the Preparation, Adoption and Application of Standards&quot;, annexed to the WTO TBT Agreement, and of the three Standardising bodies referenced in the WTO SPS Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed FIC-CAMI should foster activities which are trade related, have potential for development of certification programs, or enhance consumer protection; and which would benefit from a regional approach. Specifically, the FIC-CAMI should act as a focal point for development of regional approaches to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• standards and certification for organic products and sustainable forestry products;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• adoption of risk-based inspection approaches, especially for imported foods;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inferior/unsafe products;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• labelling of imported products;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After seven years the PIFS should review the operation of FIC-LAS, FIC-CAMI and any arrangements with JAS-ANZ to determine if any rationalization or merger of activities is possible, justified and economically viable. See also Recommendations C13 to C15 and C9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• protocols for imports of **used vehicles** and machinery;
• establishment of consumer protection bodies and appropriate consumer protection laws;
• formal training and qualifications requirements and/or licensing of tradespeople, contractors, equipment operators and building inspectors;
• a regional building code with flexibility for personal (private) and traditional structures;
• **waste management**;
• production of **biofuels** from vegetable oils;
• a standards / legislative framework covering operations of **telecoms**, which mandates use of ITU standards, safety standards, and assures interoperability for all telecoms;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16</th>
<th>That each FIC has in place legislation recognizing appropriate, internationally-recognized, accreditation bodies as authorized to accredit Conformity Assessment Bodies (CABs) as technically competent to provide testing, inspection or certification services within their jurisdiction. The criterion for such recognition should be that the accreditation body concerned is a full signatory to the relevant Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA) within the regional groupings of accreditation bodies, Asia Pacific Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (APLAC) for testing and inspection and Pacific Accreditation Cooperation (PAC) for certification.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | INSPECTION
Individual FICs should take positive action to:
- coordinate their inspection activities to avoid duplication;
- use multi-skilling and share resources to facilitate the operation of effective inspection services across all key areas; and
- provide the appropriate equipment to allow effective inspection services. |
| | Subject to acceptance of Recommendations A1 to A15, the PIF should put in place a seven-year implementation plan commencing in 2006 that will involve additional funding of approximately FJD 1.73 million over seven years |
| 17 | That each FIC has in place legislation recognizing an appropriate structure to ensure that conformity assessment activities – testing, inspection and certification – are undertaken by conformity assessment bodies that are accredited as technically competent to undertake the specific activities and that their reports and certificates will be recognized in trading partner countries. Note: These matters may be addressed in one omnibus Law | Individual FICs should take positive action to coordinate and integrate their existing and any new laboratory testing services and their metrology services. A high-level liaison committee should be formed to integrate such activities across all relevant agencies and to prioritize new initiatives |  |

| 18 | CONSUMER PROTECTION
That each FIC has in place legislation providing for market transactions to be conducted in a fair manner and at a fair price and to protect consumers from the sale of products or services that are not fit for the intended purpose | Individual FICs should take positive action to develop ongoing programs to improve the skills and competencies of their inspectors, and the quality of the inspection services. Regional accreditation by the FIC-CAMI should be a stated objective for every inspection service. See Recommendations A10 and A12 |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>That each FIC ensure that any S&amp;C activities called up in legislation or regulations for fair trading and consumer protection are consistent with the national S&amp;C infrastructure and do not conflict with requirements for regional or international trade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | **BUDGET AND IMPLEMENTATION**  
After the FIC-CAMI is established, it should review and confirm its roles, responsibilities, staffing, operations and budget. See also Recommendations A10 to A15. |
| 20  | **IMPORTS AND EXPORTS**  
That a review of the process of issuing phytosanitary certificates in each FIC be undertaken, in conjunction with the SPC, to ensure that processes are consistent and that certificates can be relied on. A programme of cross-secondments and peer evaluations would assist in harmonizing procedures and building confidence both within the region and with third markets. |
|     | Subject to acceptance of Recommendations C1 to C19, the RTFP should put in place an implementation plan commencing in 2006 that will involve additional funding of approximately FJD 1,735,000 over seven years. |
| 21  | That a review be undertaken of regulated quality assurance and/or labelling requirements for export products with a |


view to considering whether similar requirements should be implemented in other FICs, and/or for other products, in order to build and protect the region’s reputation as an exporter of safe and reliable products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22</th>
<th>DOMESTIC LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That each FIC reviews its legislation and associated regulations in public utilities, safety in the workplace, environmental protection, food, industrial products and consumer products to ensure that all technical requirements are appropriate for the outcomes required, and that measurement, Standards and conformity assessment activities called up are consistent with the national S&amp;C requirements and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Values at 2005 prices. Values in the 2005 reports, expressed in FJD, were converted to USD using the exchange rate of 12 January 2018 - 0.5 USD for 1 FJD. Domestic prices in Fiji between 2005 and 2016 grew by 50%. The USD appreciated by 12% against the FJD between 2005 and 2018. Therefore, to keep real values unchanged, 2005 cost estimates should be increased at least 40%.
## ANNEX 2
### INDICATIVE LIST OF PARTNERS OF THE PACIFIC QUALITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Possible Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)</td>
<td>Donor &amp; Forum Member</td>
<td>• Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within PACER Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)</td>
<td>Donor &amp; Forum Member</td>
<td>• Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within PACER Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Europe Aid – EU Directorate-General for International Cooperation and</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>• Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development (DG DEVCO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ChinaAid</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>• Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>• Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Enhanced Integrated Framework</td>
<td>Multi-Donor Facility – possible interest in supporting QI via T2</td>
<td>• Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standards Trade and Development Facility (STDF)</td>
<td>Multi-donor Facility supporting SPS projects – linkages with QI work</td>
<td>• Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Joint Accreditation System of Australia and New Zealand (JAS-ANZ)</td>
<td>National Accreditation Body of Forum Member</td>
<td>• Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>National Measurement Institute of Australia (NMIA)</td>
<td>National Metrology Institute of Forum Member</td>
<td>• Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fiji Department of Trade Measurements and Standards (DTMS)</td>
<td>National Standards Body of Forum Member</td>
<td>• Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PNG National Institute of Standards and Industrial Technology (NISIT)</td>
<td>National Standards Body of Forum Member</td>
<td>• Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Standards Australia</td>
<td>National Standards Body of Forum Member</td>
<td>• Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Standards New Zealand</td>
<td>National Standards Body of Forum Member</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vanuatu Bureau of Standards</td>
<td>National Standards Body of Forum Member</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt (PTB)</td>
<td>German Metrology Institute and German agency for technical cooperation in the area of Quality Infrastructure</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>British Standards Institute (BSI)</td>
<td>British Standards Institute and UK agency for technical cooperation in the area of Quality Infrastructure for Commonwealth Countries</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pacific Community</td>
<td>Regional Agency with mandate for SPS matters and implementing agency of SPS projects – linkages with QI work</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Trade Centre (ITC)</td>
<td>UN Fund – supports some QI work (e.g. Standards Map)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>United Nations Conference for Trade and Development (UNCTAD)</td>
<td>UN Program – supports some QI work (e.g. VSS)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Telecommunication Union (ITU)</td>
<td>UN Specialized Agency – International Standards Development Organization</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>World Bank Group (WBG)</td>
<td>UN Specialized Agency – supports QI work (e.g. QI Toolkit)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>United Nation Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)</td>
<td>UN Specialized Agency – very active on QI</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>World Trade Organization (WTO)</td>
<td>UN-related organization – supports QI work (e.g. TBT Agreement, training on TBT, etc.)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pacific Accreditation Cooperation (PAC)</td>
<td>Regional Asia-Pacific Accreditation Organization for Certifying and Inspection Bodies</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (APLAC)</td>
<td>Regional Asia-Pacific Accreditation Organization for Laboratories and Inspection Bodies</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asia-Pacific Legal Metrology Forum (APLMF)</td>
<td>Regional Asia-Pacific Organization of Legal Metrology Authorities,</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td>Support Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Metrology Programme (APMP)</td>
<td>Regional Asia-Pacific Organization of National Metrology Institutes</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pacific Area Standards Congress (PASC)</td>
<td>Regional Asia-Pacific Organization of Standards Bodies</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>International Accreditation Forum (IAF)</td>
<td>International Accreditation Organization for Certifying and Inspection Bodies</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>International Laboratory Accreditation Co-operation (ILAC)</td>
<td>International Accreditation Organization for Laboratories and Inspection Bodies</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Organisation Internationale de Metrologic Legale (OIML)</td>
<td>International Metrology Organization (legal metrology)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bureau international des Poids et Mesures (BIPM)</td>
<td>International Metrology Organization (physical/scientific metrology)</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>African Organisation for Standardisation (ARSO)</td>
<td>Regional African Standards Organization</td>
<td>South-South Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CARICOM Regional Organisation for Standards and Quality (CROSQ)</td>
<td>Regional Caribbean Quality Infrastructure Organization</td>
<td>South-South Cooperation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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