



**Asia-Pacific  
Economic Cooperation**

---

**2018/SOM2/SCSC/FSCF/EM/014**

## **Final Report of the Second Expert Meeting in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, May 2018**

Submitted by: Australia



**Second Expert Meeting on Trade  
Facilitation Through an APEC Framework  
on Food Safety Modernisation  
Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea  
21-22 May 2018**

# Report of the SECOND EXPERT MEETING on 'Trade Facilitation through an APEC Framework on Food Safety Modernisation'

21-22 May 2018



## Overview

The SECOND EXPERT MEETING on ‘Trade Facilitation through an APEC Framework on Food Safety Modernisation’ was held in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, 21 and 22 May 2018. The meeting was attended by 54 participants from 13 APEC member economies and 3 non-government or inter-government organisations. During the two days, information was provided by experts on internationally recognised principles of importance in modernising food safety regulation and economies shared their experience, particularly lessons learnt in the enhancement or modernisation of their food safety regulatory systems. The draft “APEC Food Safety Modernisation Framework that Facilitates Trade’ (the Framework) developed after the FIRST EXPERT MEETING held in Hanoi in November 2017, and based on comments received through two rounds of consultation with APEC member economies, was considered at the meeting. Consensus was reached on three key issues identified during the consultation. Comprehensive comments and recommendations were received on the further improvements required for the Framework.

## Participation

The SECOND EXPERT MEETING organised by Australia under the APEC project (SCSC 04 2017S) of “Trade Facilitation through an APEC Framework on Food Safety Modernisation”, was held at the Gateway Hotel, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, on 21-22 May 2018.

The meeting was attended by 54 participants (Table 1) from 13 APEC member economies and 3 non-government organisations (NGOs) or inter-government organisations (IGOs). Participants from APEC member economies included officials of various government agencies involved in food safety controls or import and export controls or domestic standards development. The NGOs and IGOs were Food Industry Asia, the World Health Organisation’s Western Pacific Regional Office, and the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) of the World Trade Organisation.

*Table 1: List of participants attending the meeting*

Economy or NGO	Number of participants
WHO – West Pacific regional Office (IGO)	1
Food Industry Asia (NGO - industry)	1
STDF (IGO)	1
Consultant (Australia)	1
Australia	6
Chile	1
China	1
Chinese Taipei	1
Indonesia	1
Malaysia	1
New Zealand	1
Papua New Guinea	29
Peru	1
Singapore	1
Thailand	1
U.S.A.	4
Viet Nam	2

Note: Acknowledgements were received from Brunei Darussalam and Republic of Korea for unable to participate in this meeting for various reasons.

## Purpose of the meeting

The purpose of this EXPERT MEETING, was to consider comments and inputs received from the electronic working group assisting the preparation of the Framework to the draft Framework circulated for comment in February 2018 and May 2018, and to further consult APEC member economies to improve the draft Framework.

## The Conduct of the Meeting

The meeting was opened by Mr Pascoe Kase, Secretary of the Department of Health, Papua New Guinea (PNG). His speech described the significance of this project, and its benefit to PNG and other APEC economies.

### Day 1

The objectives of the first day of the meeting were to:

- embrace internationally recognised principles for food safety regulation
- build consensus on featured comments on the draft APEC Framework on food safety modernisation identified following review of the first draft.

The meeting commenced with an introduction to the draft Framework, the comments received to date, and how they have been addressed. This was followed by presentations from international experts on several key principles of modern food safety regulatory systems including transparency, risk-based decision making, and equivalence. The presentations were extended to the importance of good regulatory practices to avoid non-tariff measures and challenges faced by economies at different stage of economic development in the enhancement or modernisation of their food safety regulatory systems.

Three “featured” comments received from members of the electronic working group in commenting the draft Framework were debated and clarified by meeting participants in a group activity followed by plenary discussions that enabled consensus to be reached on the issues. The “featured” comments were:

- whether the Framework should describe “an integrated domestic food safety administration system” in the development and implementation of the economy’s food safety regulatory system;
- whether the Framework should be on a food safety “regulatory system” only or cover both food safety “regulatory system” and food safety “no-regulatory system”; and
- how the Framework should describe “fraudulent and deceptive practices” in situations such practices are non-food safety nature.

Meeting participants supported the proposal for "inclusion of an integrated domestic food safety administration system" in the Framework because it is vital to the development and effective implementation of economies' food safety regulatory systems. The meeting considered that this component can be included in the section of “enabling environment” of the draft Framework. The issue about whether the Framework should be about food safety "regulatory system" only or both food safety "regulatory system" and food safety "non-regulatory system" attracted good discussion. The food safety non-regulatory system refers to industry-established food safety regulations that are outside of the government food safety regulatory system. The meeting agreed that the Framework should be about "food safety regulatory system" only due to the vast number of variables associated with food safety non-regulatory system such as sector specific food safety requirements, lack of a

domestic coordination, and often the non-enforcement nature of the food safety controls under such systems. The meeting also agreed that "fraudulent and deceptive practices" should be included in the Framework for food safety purpose. The Framework should describe the importance of "fraudulent and deceptive practices" of non-food safety nature because such practices do jeopardise consumer confidence on the economy's food safety regulatory system, and can impact negatively on trade.

The meeting further clarified the "Purpose" and "Scope" of the Framework.

## Day 2

The objectives of the second day of the meeting were to:

- value the experience gained by APEC member economies in food safety modernisation or enhancement;
- build consensus on the draft APEC framework on food safety modernisation.

The presentations provided by Australia, the United States and Chile on experience gained and lessons learnt from their respective food safety enhancement or modernisation activities were well received by meeting participants. Relevant questions asked by meeting participants and the discussions followed, imparted a level of capacity building at the meeting. As summarised by Dr Trish Desmarchelier, the following matters are vital to the success of either an enhancement or modernisation of an economy' food safety regulatory system:

- 1) ensuring an effective communication with stakeholders;
- 2) taking a through-chain approach in managing food safety;
- 3) moving away from prescriptive control measures;
- 4) prioritising and taking a phased approach in dealing with food safety management in situations where the enhancement or modernisation of the food safety regulatory system impacts on multiple food sectors;
- 5) making risk management decision based on science and evidence; and
- 6) collaborating with stakeholders.

Meeting participants examined the adequacy of the draft Framework section by section through a group activity and plenary discussions. Comments/suggestions valuable to the improvement of draft Framework were generated. The following list represents the main comments/suggestions which will assist the revision of the draft Framework.

- The Framework should have a description that provides appropriate background to readers
- The Framework needs to have its own/unique attractiveness to readers/users
- The Framework should describe the intended benefits
- The Framework needs to be concise
- The Framework should not reinvent the wheels, but referencing the relevant international principles
- The Framework should contain relevant case studies
- The outlook of the Framework should be improved through appropriated graphic design
- The Framework should make it clear that implementation described under section 3.2.3 of the current version of the draft Framework refers to the implementation of the economy's strategy in food safety modernisation or enhancement
- The Framework needs to ensure consistency in expressions used
- The Framework should avoid prescriptiveness

- The Framework should include a component for "monitoring and evaluation" of the development and implementation of economy's strategy in the enhancement or modernisation of the economy's food safety regulatory system
- The Framework should make clear for its list of references but not bibliography

Day 2 of the expert meeting concluded with an information session on the next steps for the development of the Framework and on several workshops under APEC food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF) and its Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN).

The expert meeting was closed formally by Mr Pascoe Kase, Secretary of the Department of Health, PNG. Mr Kase's speech summarised the achievements of the two day expert meeting, commanded highly on the contributions made by individual participants at the meeting and the excellent support provided by the PNG APEC team.

## Outcome of the meeting

### Summary of presentations

Key principles of modern food safety regulatory control systems

**Transparency** Ms Camille Brewer of the USFDA, addressed the importance of transparency in food safety rulemaking. She presented examples of its application during the development of the U.S.A. Food Safety Modernisation Act (FSMA), the benefits of transparency to stakeholders, and the broader contribution of the transparency to the efficiency and effectiveness of regulations created under FSMA. Core concepts recommended included consultation, communication and collaboration between public and private sectors, and coordination and capacity building to close the gap between developing and developed economies in the APEC region.

**Risk-based decision making and good regulatory practices** Mr Pablo Jenkins of WTO's STDF, discussed how to meet APEC economies' health protection objectives while minimising costs and reducing procedural obstacles to trade in the development and implementation of sanitary and phytosanitary measures (SPS measures) for food safety. Recommended approaches included: applying risk-based decision making, good regulatory practices, and equivalence and mutual recognition agreements; and improving transparency, coordination, collaboration and operational efficiencies in developing and implementing food safety regulatory measures.

**Equivalence** Mr Bruce Burdon of New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries, discussed the principle of equivalence in food safety regulation and drew attention to the guidance developed by Codex and WTO. He shared the NZ experience focusing on an evidence-, risk- and performance-based approach to measuring equivalence, and a broader systems recognition concept resulting in minimisation of use of resources and unnecessary trade restrictions while maintaining food safety standards.

**Food safety modernisation by economies at different stages of economic development** Mr Peter Sousa Hoejskov of WHO Regional Office for the Western Pacific, presented the approach to strengthening food safety systems in the Western Pacific Region where the countries are diverse and at different stages of economic development, and where the capacity, institutional arrangements and priorities in food safety systems in individual countries vary. While aligning with international recommendations and obligations, the approach is country-tailored, step wise, encourages prioritisation of interventions and focus on overall improvement in the system's performance, and

focuses on strengthening the uniformity of the food safety systems at different stages of development.

Presentations on country experience in food safety modernisation or enhancement

**Australia** Kate Astridge of Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ), gave an overview of the overall food regulatory model in Australia and the experience in the development and implementation of Australia's Primary Production and Processing Standards (PPP standards). Management of food safety in Australia has been transformed from previously prescriptive measures to an outcome-based requirements, and throughout of the food supplying chain, i.e. from the production of food to food processing, packaging, storage, transportation and retail sale. Kate provided some valuable insights and lessons learned in the development and implementation of Australia's PPP standards, including appreciating the complexity of the overall food supply chain, taking a staged approach in developing food safety regulatory measures for multiple food sectors, applying food safety risk analysis framework, embracing a science- and evidence-based, and transparent approach, using internationally accepted guidance, and emphasizing the value of stakeholder communication and collaboration.

**U.S.A.** Camille Brewer of USDA, shared the approach in the U.S.A. for the development and implementation of the FSMA. The FSMA's main themes are prevention, enhanced partnerships, inspections, compliance and response, and import safety. Under the FSMA, food importers are responsible for ensuring their foreign suppliers meet U.S.A. domestic food safety standards. This model is based on seven foundational rules concerning three broad food groups, third party certification, sanitary transportation and international adulteration, for which extensive guidance documents are provided. The FSMA provides for capacity building with foreign governments with respect to food safety and international communications and engagement, development of alliances, and the future use of big data.

**Chile** Diego Varela of Chile Ministry of Agriculture, presented the food safety control system model in Chile. Their approach is for a coordinated National Food Safety and Quality System managed through an agency whose objective is to implement, coordinate and steer the system through coordination and integration of several ministries and institutions involved and broad stakeholder engagement. Enforcement is managed by separate agencies. Food safety regulations are developed using risk analysis, science and evidence, and considers both health protection and competitive development of the food industry that is important to the Chilean economy. Chile participates in Codex and works to build strategic partnerships internationally. The aim is to add value through correction, improvement and innovation.

Presentations made at the Port Moresby Expert Meeting are accessible via **this APEC link**.

## Framework development

Consensus on featured comments arising from the draft APEC Framework on Food Safety Modernisation

Three key comments were featured in the responses from member economies to the draft Framework circulated. These comments were discussed in breakout sessions and following plenary sessions where consensus was reached as follows:

1. Should the Framework include "an integrated domestic food safety administration system"?

*Consensus:* The proposal for "inclusion of an integrated domestic food safety administration

system" in the Framework was supported.

2. Should the Framework cover "regulatory system" only or both "regulatory and no-regulatory system"?

*Consensus:* Participants supported that the Framework should be about a "food safety regulatory system" only. Clarification for the Purpose and Scope of the Framework is required to reflect this consensus.

3. Should the Framework cover "fraudulent and deceptive practices" when the issues are not of a food safety nature?

*Consensus:* The meeting agreed that "fraudulent and deceptive conduct" should be included in the Framework in reference to food safety matters; however, the Framework should indicate the importance of "fraudulent and deceptive conduct" of a non-food safety nature as such issues do jeopardise consumer confidence on the food safety regulatory system, and impact negatively on trade. The meeting noted that Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Certification and Inspection (CCFICS) has work underway in this area and the Framework should reference to the CCFICS document when it is available.

#### Adequacy of the Draft Framework

Main points from comments and recommendations to consider in revision are summarised.

#### *General comments*

- Framework's unique context is the modernization and enhancement focus
- focus on the new and modern aspects of a food safety regulatory system, such as e-commerce
- recognize development levels of the economies; language needs to be flexible to allow for growth, including a stepwise process or possibly a work plan
- place a priority on the effective and efficient use of resources throughout the modernization process
- approach as guidance document using consistent and appropriate language, APEC context, forward thinking
- suggestions on format - short as possible, simple, use sub-headings, include examples, use text boxes for links, examples etc., "personality", use graphic design in the final format.

#### *Specific comments*

##### Introduction

- encourage reader interest and indicate what a reader can expect from the document
- take out the background
- Use subheadings to emphasize
- include expected outcomes, benefits of using this document
- APEC Food Safety Cooperation Forum context
- modernisation of food safety systems to APEC economies e.g. protection health, trade facilitation, economy, efficiency, effectiveness etc.

### Purpose and Scope

- re-word given consensus on focus on food safety regulatory system
- a bit more introductory on why, why trade outcome, benefits, food safety, trade and efficiency
- industry, retailers, consumer groups, academia are all key stakeholders and they should have an opportunity to provide input on this document, regardless of the final scope

### Definitions

- cross-check definitions required as document develops; reference internationally
- define “food safety regulatory system”
- delete “National-Food Control System”
- reference instead of repeat definitions, but define specific terms

### Principles

- re-arrange sequence in the order of importance
- align with revised scope; focus on health protection and less on non-food safety related areas
- other terms – expand on trade facilitation, preventive measures
- Principle 1 – appropriate SPS text; food fraud in a separate paragraph; expand trade facilitation
- Principle 2 – change “... adequate consumer protection ...” to “... adequate consumer health protection...”
- Principle 4 – include “preventative measures”
- Principle 5 – take out “education”
- Principle 8 should be divided, the second paragraph is another principle; minimise prescriptiveness with better choice of words, such as “should” and “shall”

#### 3.2.1 Enabling environment

- Ensure identify key components, alignment of perspective; concise, flexible; include the component of “an integrated domestic food safety administration system”

#### 3.2.2 Set strategy

- agreed focus/priority on protecting human health and in turn facilitation of trade
- include - stakeholder perspective, consultation, collaboration and transparency
- reflect “food safety regulatory system”
- use generic examples from APEC economies (unanimously)
- emphasise co-ordination, collaboration and flexibility in design
- possibly Codex guidelines, and FAO, WHO, OIE test can go into a separate box

#### 3.2.3 System design and development

- “a policy body...” un the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph is considered prescriptive, suggest to use flexible terms
- For the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, add “international collaboration, exchange of information”, and case studies can be incorporated into the last sentence
- For the last paragraph, define “stakeholders” who should be both domestic and international stakeholders; the last sentence is repetitive and should be removed
- ensure consistency in expression

### 3.2.4 Implementation

- ensure the content is right for this section
- implementation refers to the implementation of the domestic food safety strategy set under section 3.2.2
- ensure consistency in terminology, such as “food safety regulatory system”
- more specific options for actions needed; generic and practical
- stepwise approach needed; reference FAO 2007
- use of the principles in the implementation

### 3.2.5 Evaluation and improvement

- last step in stepwise approach above
- focus on country regulatory system i.e. GRP and RIA (Regulatory Impact Analysis) to be considered
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph reads like an “introduction”

### References

- change to ‘supporting documents’
- add FAO risk management guidelines
- other key documents to be advised by members

### Case studies

- benefits of the document could be articulated and clarified via case studies/lessons learned by APEC economies
- working group agreed that it would be useful to have case studies if they were concise, visually appealing and relevant
- suggested areas for case studies:
  - notification timelines, transparency options, phased approaches, benefits to trade, resultant efficiencies, increased effectiveness
- Some recommended examples:
  - Implementation: Australia, Indonesia, PNG
  - Evaluation (GRP, RIA): Australia

### Other recommendations

- “monitoring” of the implementation of the food safety regulatory system should be included as a component of the Framework
- conversation has started on the “implementation of the Framework” once it is finalized, will be considered as the next step of this project (in a new project), additional guidance material which provides step by step guidance, will be required for the implementation of the Framework
- “evaluation” of the project should be considered

### Consensus on Framework document

- Drafting team will revise draft Framework taking meeting outcomes into consideration and re-circulate

### Third expert meeting

The objective of the THIRD EXPERT MEETING will be to finalise the Framework and to demonstrate the applicability and utility using real-life examples.

The timeframe for revision of the Framework:

- Revision and re-circulation 4<sup>th</sup> version among electronic working group mid-June 2018
- 4 weeks for consultation on revised draft; one set of comments from each economy only
- Further revision, 5<sup>th</sup> version circulated among electronic working group early August
- Final or near final version of the Framework late September 2018 which will be tabled at the 3rd expert meeting for finalisation
- Third meeting 5-6/11/2018, at Marriott Shanghai City or close by

## Meeting evaluation by participants

26 out of 43 participants present in the afternoon of day 2 of the Expert Meeting responded to the evaluation. This represents an overall 60% response rate.

The respondents were generally positive and in particular considered the agenda was relevant and the experts/facilitators were well prepared and knowledgeable about the topics. Areas with lower scores that could be addressed included meeting the intended objectives.

Table 2 Participants evaluation of the meeting. (Score 3 = strongly agree, 2 agree, 1 disagree)

Question	Average score	Extent of agreement (%)
The objectives and the meeting were clearly defined	2.52	84
The meeting achieved its intended objectives	2.36	79
The agenda items and topics covered were relevant	2.73	91
The content was well organised and easy to follow	2.62	87
Gender <sup>1</sup> issues were sufficiently addressed during implementation	2.39	80
The trainers/experts or facilitators were well prepared and knowledgeable about the topics	2.73	91
The time allocated to each session was adequate	2.54	85
The time allocated for the training was sufficient	2.54	85

Comments from respondents are summarized below and detailed comments from the evaluations are provided in Appendix A.

Most respondents indicated the meeting was highly relevant to their respective economies (Question 1; average score 4.56/5, 91%). The level of relevance for a respondent appeared commensurate with the stage of development of food safety control systems in their economies.

Most respondents commented the results or achievement of the meeting were bringing together expertise from different APEC economies and economic counterparts, sharing experiences and reaching consensus on a path forward to complete a guideline for APEC economies on Food Safety Modernisation (Question 2). One respondent was unsure/concerned on the usefulness of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Female participation rate from participants outside of PNG at this meeting was 40%.

material and how their economy could use the Framework due to lack of exposure to the various documents provided to APEC member economies under this project.

Respondents gained new skills and knowledge of food safety control systems and modernisation and on the importance of food safety control in relation to trade among APEC economies from the presentations, discussions and group work components. They emphasised the value of sharing experiences and understanding among APEC economies on views, approaches, needs and challenges in this area and on need for communication and collaboration (Question 3).

Sixteen of the 23 respondents recorded their knowledge had increased during the meeting (Questions 4 and 5). This was related to understanding the Framework development, learning about food safety management and its relationship with trade, and learning about other economies. Observers from the host country who were less familiar with the project found it a valuable learning experience.

Respondents will use the knowledge gained in further development of the Framework (Question 6). However, broader applications were noted where respondents will use the knowledge when they return to their respective economies, by sharing information with colleagues and in undertaking their various roles in their country's food safety control systems and in trade matters. One respondent indicated they would need many more examples of how to apply the suggestions before this framework can be useful.

When asked what needs to be done next by APEC respondents, continuation of the project taking into account the outcomes of this meeting was supported by most, some offering additional suggestions (Question 7). One respondent commented the finalised document should not be distributed until it is packaged in a more useable form. Additional suggestions were inclusion of food quality issues important to trade, for APEC to monitor developments in member economies, (pilot) training/capacity building programmes, organisation and coordination of activities, and more media communication to advertise the outcomes and progress of the project.

While some were satisfied with project to date given the ongoing improvements to be made as outlined in the meeting outcome section above, other improvements were suggested (Question 8). The need for a key reason to have this framework at APEC and the uniqueness were questioned. For the Shanghai meeting it was suggested to spend time on text only to use time most efficiently. More group discussions with participant involvement was requested. Earlier distribution of documents and longer times for comments were requested as well as better/early communications with venue provider and the host economy. Also, it would be very helpful to have plenary presentations from developing countries on their issues and challenges in modernising food safety as most of the presentations reflected the experience of highly developed economies.

## Appendix A Written comments received in the evaluation survey

The comments are summarised.

### Question 1: How relevant was this expert meeting to you and your economy?

17 responses

- The meeting was relevant as food safety is considered a great concern and more and more consumers focus on food safety
- Six respondents commented the meeting was highly relevant as their economy does not have an existing functioning food safety regulatory system. They currently rely on legislation that can be outdated. Need to develop domestic food safety control system. This project will enable their economy to realise the need to be compatible with other APEC economies and may be used to leverage government support.
- For other economies, Governments are working to enhance their food safety control system so that the meeting and proposed framework are very timely to learn and improve their approach, to understand the difference between food control systems in economies, and food safety regulatory approaches.
- Further economies found the meeting useful as they are reviewing their food safety regulatory system
- Several respondents referred to the increasing openness in their markets with more and more foreign food entering their domestic markets and challenges of how to guard food safety, and thus on the value of clarity regarding NFCSs and harmonisation in APEC economies to foster trade
- Respondents noted they will inspect their own ability to trade with APEC economies

### Question 2 In your view what were the project's results/achievements?

24 responses

- 20 respondents commented the meeting achieved bringing together expertise from different APEC economies and economic counterparts to share experience and develop a guideline for APEC economies, clarifying controversial issues and achieving consensus for the framework, and mapping out the path to reach completion for the development of the Framework

Other comments:

- It enlightened the level of development in food safety mechanisms in other economies
- It showed the commitment of the region in enhancing food safety and in gaining a consensus from economies in improving and modernising their regulatory system through a risk-based approach
- Still have to review the framework; stakeholder should have consensus to finalise the framework
- Unsure/concerned that this will be a useful material. It is unclear how my economy can use this.

### Question 3 What new skills and Knowledge did you gain from this event?

24 responses

- 17 respondents commented the presentations, discussions and group work provided knowledge of the development of food safety control systems and its components and

emphasised the value of sharing experiences and fostering understanding among APEC economies on their individual views, approaches, needs and challenges and need for communication and collaboration

Other comments:

- Learnt the experience of other economies; understanding that there is a need for harmonising food safety regulatory systems between economies to address issue of efficiency
- Learnt the importance of inter-agency co-ordinations to ensure an integrated food safety control system and the challenges associated with it in APEC economies
- The importance of food safety regulation and developing a system is essential in our economy
- Importance of referencing other resources to avoid duplication
- Assessment of the linkage between local regulations and international guidelines
- Wider elements of Codex guidelines
- Knowledge about the relevant international documents related to food safety and food safety control systems in other economies plus method to develop a guideline
- Better understanding of the draft documents and global developments that motivated this project

Question 4 and 5 Rate your level of skills and knowledge in the topic before and after the meeting

16 respondents recorded their knowledge had increased and the following explanations were received from 14 responses:

- 5 respondents commented they gained a greater understanding of the Framework and what it may achieve
- 2 respondents commented they had very little knowledge of the working group and work on food safety in APEC economies; however, they learnt so much in the 2-day workshop
- 2 respondents commented on general increase in knowledge in the area was enhanced.

Other comments:

- Learnt more about APEC economies
- Learnt new ways of addressing food safety
- The system has expanded my understanding on various guidelines beyond knowledge of WTO agreements and Codex
- This event helped in understanding more about the need of a modernisation framework that can protect consumers' health and also facilitate trade in food safety management system at domestic level.
- I am able to distinguish the need to address food safety systems that will create the enabling environment for effective trade systems

Question 6 How will you apply the meeting's content and knowledge?

24 responses

- 2 respondents will take the comments positively in revising the current draft of the Framework; support the project further, support other APEC FSCF activities and bilateral initiatives

- 5 respondents will use knowledge to provide advice, guide and contribute to development of their country's policy on food safety control, domestic constitution mediated by mandated food safety authority
- 3 respondents will share information with colleagues
- As domestic coordinator on food safety, I will share the experience to colleagues in other sectors such as Agriculture and trade officers
- Share information and outcome to inform bilateral engagement
- Use to contribute effectively in the government team that looks at formalising relevant government policies/regulations
- 2 respondents will use their knowledge to strengthen, further develop or improve the policy and strategies related to regulation, i.e. framework of food safety guidance, development of regulations or procedure to link with APEC framework
- 2 respondents: use in work on the need for and the development of further work plans, strategies for the future and the aspect of evaluation programs
- Develop workplans/strategies but more important work to initiate policy and legislative framework that can be consistent with intention of the Framework
- 2 respondents: use principles in reviewing foods safety regulatory systems and look at the domestic process to update legislation
- Collaborate with other stakeholders to address food safety at operational level
- Knowledge will contribute to work as the country focal point in ASEAN working group on standards
- 2 respondents state it may assist when liaising with APEC economies when evaluating food safety systems for specific (imported) commodities and with the implementation of equivalence
- Develop new procedures when it comes to biosecurity (Quarantine) inspections of agricultural and food products
- Report to my organisation my experience at the workshop, and request that we attend more future workshop to contribute proactively in the project tiled to this APEC forum
- Need many more examples of how to apply the suggestions before this can be useful

Question 7 What needs to be done next by APEC? Are there plans to link the project's outcome to subsequent collective actions by fora or individual actions by economies?

21 responses

- 8 respondents commented generally to continue with the project and the development of the framework; review/take comments on board from participants

Other comments:

- In order to facilitate trade, a broader scope must be addressed. NFCS is not only food safety, but also food quality issues which are important to trade
- Finalised document should not be distributed until it is repackaged in a more useable form
- Support implementation and evaluation
- Plan for adoption and implementation of the Framework
- Discussions on achievement of the framework project
- It would be good to see APEC monitor the development of individual food safety mechanisms in member economies

- Develop (pilot) training/capacity building programmes on how to implement some of the areas in the framework into the economies
- Consideration for applying this framework in a part of food control activities, as applicable to improve foods safety measure at domestic level
- Organise the organisations that deal with food safety and coordinate the activities
- Maybe more media communication to advertise about the outcomes and progress of the project to reaffirm the commitment of economies in strengthening food safety/food safety regulatory systems
- Developing economies to present as well
- Understand food safety systems, improve domestic food systems

Question 8 How could this project be improved? Please provide comments on how to improve the project if relevant

16 responses

- Excellent already
- Current work carried out is sufficient
- Need for a key reason to have this framework at APEC

Other comments

- The objectives of the meeting were refined in the workshop
- I felt that because I didn't have the privilege of reading material from the 1st meeting. I couldn't contribute meaningfully to discussions; 2. I felt the workshop could have been adequately covered in 3 days
- Not enough time to go into the details to review the text (but this may be improved by enhancing the participation during the eWG consultation)
- Progress achieved in revising the Framework, but the process is not finished
- Gender issues was not discussed
- It would be very helpful to have plenary presentation from developing countries on their issues and challenges in modernising food safety. Most of the presentations reflected the experience of highly developed economies. It was unfortunate that the organisers did not invite PNG to do one of the presentations. It would also have been helpful to have one of the food safety experts participate in session 2 of Day 1 or Session 1 on Day 2.

Lessons learned

1. While preparation for this meeting started in February 2018, confirmation of the meeting dates was only available in the last week of March 2018. This has impacted on the time required for APEC member economies to nominate their attendees to this expert meeting.
2. It is noted that some of the APEC economies has been not responded to the call for participation in this expert meeting. Contributing factors to this silence include 1) procedural failure of the APEC economy in communication, and 2) the message did not reach the right authority responsible for food safety control in the economy. This project will communicate this issue to the APEC FSCF Secretariat to find a way to address the communication issue.