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**Introduction**

In preparation for the 3rd meeting of the Food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF), a review of progress has been undertaken. To undertake this, member economies were asked to contribute to an analysis of progress towards the FSCF goals and the FSCF 2009 recommendations. In reviewing progress, APEC member economies have provided input on their key successes and key challenges in addressing the goals of the FSCF; and the FSCF 2009 recommendations. In addition, member economies have proposed key forward directions for the work of the FSCF from 2011 – 2013. The following provides a broad analysis of input from member economies.

**The FSCF Goals**

When the Food Safety Cooperation Forum (FSCF) was established in Australia, in 2007, it was agreed that the FSCF goals would be:

1. Transparent information-sharing and communication networks that provide accurate and timely information to consumers and producers on food safety.

2. Food safety regulatory systems within economies, including food inspection/assurance and certification systems that:

2.1 are consistent with members’ rights and obligations under the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) and the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreements of the World Trade Organisation; and

2.2 are harmonized, to the extent possible, with international standards (such as Codex, OIE, IPPC).

3. Enhanced skills and human resource capacities to enable the development of national food safety regulatory frameworks that are harmonized with international standards.

**The FSCF 2009 Recommendations:**

When the FSCF met in 2009, the following recommendations were made with respect to the FSCF forward work plan for 2009 – 2011.

1. Build on already established communication networks and processes, specifically by:
	1. Establishing and maintaining a data base with contact points from each APEC member economy that have specific areas of expertise, for example risk assessment;
	2. Sharing information on emerging food safety issues and during food safety emergencies, noting that in doing so, information may be sensitive and appropriate agreements may need to be reached;
	3. Strengthening WHO member participation in INFOSAN to increase the ability to respond to food safety emergencies of international significance; and
	4. Promoting access to FSCF documents, reports of food safety capacity building activities and, where appropriate, training materials via the FSCF website.
2. Continue to focus on priority food safety capacity building needs, consistent with the results of the national food control systems needs assessment, as identified in the agreed FSCF *Capacity Building Priority Areas*, with associated activities identified in the FSCF *Implementation Plan 2007-2011.*
3. Strengthening the coordination and implementation of food safety capacity building activities, utilising a broad range of government, industry and academic stakeholders. We will look to achieve this, particularly through providing strong support to the implementation of the FSCF Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN);
4. Actively consider ways to transfer and measure the successes achieved in the areas of capacity building, to address the FSCF goal of achieving food safety regulatory systems that are consistent with international standards as recommended in the World Trade Organisation SPS/TBT Agreements. An initial step in this direction could potentially be to work towards aligning standards, for example for maximum residue limits with international standards.

**1. Key successes of the FSCF from 2009 - 2011**

#### 1.1. Raising the profile of food safety and the APEC Food Safety Cooperation Forum

Since the FSCF met in 2009, the prominence of food safety as a key issue within the APEC region has continued to grow. The FSCF and its Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN) has contributed to this growth through involvement in a range of both APEC and non-APEC activities.

In relation to the work being undertaken within APEC on food security, the FSCF has contributed to the *Food* *Security Action Plan.* The planincludes a range of food safety activities either planned or undertaken by the FSCF and its PTIN. In addition, the FSCF developed a *Briefing Note on Food Safety: Ensuring Reliable Sources of Safe Food Is a Critical Element of Food Security Initiatives* to support the contention that food security goals will not be achieved without integrating food safety into regional and global action plans going forward*.* This document clearly outlines the linkage between food safety and food security.

The Briefing Note was presented to the 2009 APEC Business Advisory Council (ABAC), by the FSCF Co-Chairs and tabled at the ABAC Food Security Workshop held in Bangkok, in August 2010. The strong linkage between food safety and food security was also discussed and reported at the First APEC Ministerial Meeting on Food Security and subsequently acknowledged in the *Niigata Declaration on APEC Food Security*, in October 2010.

The *Conceptual Framework and Strategy for Improving Food Safety in APEC and Global Food Supply Chains : Food Safety: A Priority for Improving Public Health and Economic Growth,* developed by the FSCF, provides the direction and scope of the work of the FSCF and its Partnership Training Institute Network (PTIN). Thisdocument will contribute to efforts in advocating the importance of food safety in the APEC region to key regional/international organisations and donors. The document also indicates how the FSCF and its PTIN can be used as a model in other regions of the world.

#### 1.2 Ongoing work of the FSCF Co-Chairs and Secretariat

In raising the profile and supporting the work of the FSCF, the FSCF Co-Chairs have demonstrated strong leadership and cooperation in working together and contributing to all relevant FSCF and its PTIN events since 2009. The Co-Chairs and their representatives have worked on establishing relationships between APEC member economies and relevant international/regional organisations to address the goals of FSCF.

The FSCF has continued to be supported by the FSCF secretariat, through Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ), Australia; and the Import and Export Food Safety Bureau, General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ), China. The secretariat continues to play a vital role in facilitating communication between member economies in relation to the work of the FSCF; coordinating and liaising with member economies in relation to FSCF and its PTIN activities; closely coordinating input regarding APEC food safety proposals to the APEC Sub-Committee for Standards and Conformance (SCSC); and providing regular reports to the SCSC.

The Co-Chairs have demonstrated the benefits of staff interchanges, with a member of the Chinese Co-Chair team undertaking a placement at FSANZ, with the Australian Co-Chair team (as done in 2009), to work collaboratively in preparing for the FSCF 2011 events.

# 1.3 Transparent information-sharing and communication networks that provide accurate and timely information to consumers and producers on food safety (Goal 1)

The FSCF and its PTIN have facilitated communication networks and information sharing between member economies in a number of ways, including face to face meetings, workshops and regular email updates. In particular, the range and involvement of stakeholders involved in the FSCF PTIN has expanded significantly since 2009.

 A number of economies noted that the FSCF meeting works particularly well as a platform to build and maintain food regulatory relationships to address key food safety issues, including successes and challenges in this area. One specific example was noted by Mexico, where in the event of a food safety incident, the sharing of information was made more effective through the FSCF networks that had been established.

A key outcome in improving information sharing and communication networks has been the development of the linked FSCF and PTIN websites, which are also linked to the APEC website. These websites provide a platform for: information sharing about all FSCF and its PTIN activities; access to reproducible FSCF PTIN training modules; links to existing training; and improved access to technical information and resources.

# 1.4 Food safety regulatory systems that are consistent with WTO SPS/TBT Agreements and are harmonised, to the extent possible, with international standards (Goal 2)

It was noted by a number of member economies that the work of the FSCF had contributed significantly to advancing the development and review of their national food legislation and food standards. These changes have been attributed to increased knowledge attained through FSCF capacity building activities such as the *Development of Food Laws, Regulations and Standards* and *Enforcement and Recall Systems.* In addition, the Philippines noted that work to advance their food safety system commenced as a result of the FSCF capacity building activity *Capacity Building Needs of National Food Control Systems in APEC Developing Economies.*

Member economies reported that the 2010 *Export Certification Roundtable* provided an opportunity for discussion of common issues and concerns related to the use of export certificates. The outcomes of the Roundtable also provided a way forward for the work towards achieving consistent standards, practices and processes that are aligned to Codex Guidelines in this area. To follow on from this, an FSCF Expert Working Group is to be convened in August 2011, to advance the outcomes of the Roundtable, address export certificate requirements in APEC and explore how APEC can contribute to strengthening Codex Guidelines in this area. This work will contribute directly to the trade facilitation goals of the FSCF.

In response to the FSCF 2009 Recommendations, a discussion paper on maximum residue limits (MRLs)in the APEC Regionhas been developed in consultation with the FSCF. This paper proposes that a focus on advancing regulatory cooperation related to MRLs be used to progress work on this FSCF goal. This will provide an initial approach to working towards greater harmonisation of standards in the APEC region. To progress this work, a set of forward recommendations will be agreed to at FSCF 2011, contributing directly to the FSCF goals.

#### 1.5 Progress and growth of the FSCF Partnership Training Institute Network

Since the establishment of the FSCF PTIN in 2008 and the first face- to- face meeting of the FSCF PTIN Steering Group in July 2009, the participation in the FSCF PTIN has grown considerably; involving a broad network of industry and academic stakeholders, in addition to the government regulators and food scientists. This has expanded the expert base to enhance the FSCF, a forum of food regulators.

The FSCF PTIN has also developed linkages with key international and regional bodies associated with food safety. A successful example of this is the partnership between the FSCF, its PTIN and World Bank. This has involved World Bank partial sponsorship of FSCF PTIN events; World Bank funding for development of the FSCF PTIN’s first training modules; collaboration on analysis of food safety capacity building needs in the APEC region at the Food Safety Expert Group Meeting held in May 2010; and the planned signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between APEC and the World Bank in May 2011, on food safety capacity building.

Several other activities undertaken through the FSCF PTIN have successfully assisted member economies in working towards to the FSCF goals. The development of a roadmap by the FSCF PTIN Expert Working Group in combination with the FSCF PTIN website has improved availability, accessibility and use of food safety training materials based on international standards and best practices and identified best practices for delivery and dissemination of training materials.

#### 1.6 Enhanced skill and human resource capacities (Goal 3)

At least one economy reported that the FSCF agreed priority food safety capacity building priorities were used as a guideline for developing national priorities and programs.

Several capacity building activities have been successfully undertaken through both FSCF and its PTIN, since 2009. This takes the total capacity building activities since the commencement of the FSCF in 2007 and the establishment of the FSCF PTIN in 2008, to 32 capacity building activities, with participants from 20 member economies, held in 11 economies throughout the APEC region.

A complete list of activities that have been undertaken by the FSCF and its PTIN are reported in the *FSCF Implementation Plan and Record of Activities 2007-2011.* Listed below aresome of the key activities implemented since 2009:

* *APEC FSCF Developing Food Laws, Standards and Enforcement and Recall Systems, Beijing, China, August 2009*
* *APEC FSCF PTIN Examination of Hot Issues in Risk Analysis* Workshop, Singapore, August 2009
* *APEC FSCF* *Development of Food Laws, Standards and Regulations*, Manila, the Philippines, August 2009
* *APEC FSCF PTIN Export Certification Roundtable, Gold Coast, Australia, February 2010*
* *APEC FSCF* *Managing Food Safety Incidents*, Beijing, China, March – May 2010
* *APEC FSCF Development and Strengthening of Food Recall Systems for APEC Developing Economies,* Manila, the Philippines, May 2010
* *APEC FSCF PTIN Expert Working Group on Food Safety*, Washington, USA, May 2010
* *APEC FSCF Training on Risk-based Inspection*, Manila, the Philippines, October 2010
* *APEC FSCF PTIN Managing Food Safety throughout the Supply Chain*, Beijing, China, November 2010; and the
* *APEC FSCF PTIN Food Safety Incident Management Seminar*, Montana, USA, May 2011

#### 1.7 Progress against the 2009 recommendations

For each of the FSCF 2009 Recommendations, activities have been undertaken and outcomes achieved. This has contributed to progress in addressing the goals of the FSCF.

A detailed outline of all activities undertaken in response to the FSCF 2009 recommendations and the impacts of each of the activities is at Attachment 1.

**2. Key challenges experienced in addressing the FSCF Goals and**

**FSCF 2009 Recommendations**

Many of the challenges experienced in addressing the FSCF goals that were identified in the *2009 Review of Progress* are still being reported by member economies.

**2.1 Transparent information sharing and communication networks (Goal 1)**

Whilst significant improvements in information sharing and communication networks were achieved over the past two years, there are still challenges in many APEC member economies, related to limited capabilities in the area of information technology. This has been particularly apparent when economies have needed to access information relating to food safety emergencies that have taken place on a regional and/or global scale. Specific issues contributing to this relate to limited human resources, equipment, knowledge and skills.

It was noted by at least two economies that there are certain challenges associated with using INFOSAN and given this, it would be very useful to have an additional, informal FSCF food safety emergency network that could provide an informal and very efficient mechanism for information exchange between FSCF colleagues.

It was suggested that all final reports of FSCF and PTIN activities be posted to the FSCF and PTIN websites, in order to share the experiences and outcomes with those not involved.

#### 2.2 Food safety regulatory systems that are consistent with Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS) and the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Agreements of the World Trade Organisation; and harmonized, where possible, with international standards (such as Codex, OIE, and IPPC) (Goal 2)

Capacity building is a recognised mechanism for facilitating desired change. The FSCF has successfully utilised various capacity building activities to improve knowledge across the region of many aspects of food safety regulatory systems. These activities have encouraged use of international standards and best practices and have contributed directly to the work of achieving this FSCF goal. However, food safety systems are very complex, with a multitude of factors that influence change and outcomes. Given this, it is recognised how challenging it can be to gain specific agreements and harmonisation of standards across 21 diverse economies. To improve this situation, a greater understanding of individual member economy’s systems is needed, with structured processes for information exchange that could assist in finding ways to address these challenges.

Another key challenge reported by developing member economies with regard to harmonisation of food safety standards is their limited expertise and knowledge in risk analysis and particularly in various aspects of risk assessment for example, chemical and microbiological risk assessment. This is a major barrier to developing scientific, risk-based food safety regulations.

Limited resources to improve knowledge and skills in risk analysis, was noted as a barrier to the improvement of food safety standards. Similarly, a lack of infrastructure and resources in the areas of food inspection and laboratory capacity was noted as a major barrier to improvements in this area.

Generally, it was noted by several member economies that the effort to target limited resources effectively, to maximise change, is difficult and it would be helpful if there was greater scope for sharing information and expertise across the region.

**2.3 Enhanced skills and human resource capacities (Goal 3)**

One of the key challenges identified by member economies in undertaking capacity building was the lack of support from within member economies from the range of agencies involved in the regulation of food safety. This was largely attributed to an inability to influence key decision makers from within relevant agencies.

It was noted that the majority of FSCF work undertaken by economies, particularly those that are providing capacity building assistance, is in addition to the core work of the agencies involved. From a resource perspective, this makes it difficult to sustain the gains that are made and it should be recognised that the work undertaken through the FSCF and its PTIN often relies on in-kind support of member economy governments.

To undertake capacity building in an effective way, sustainable funds are required. To continue to obtain funds for individual activities is inefficient, but obtaining longer term, sustainable funds, has been difficult to achieve. One barrier relating to funding, specifically mentioned by developing economies, was that of gaining APEC funding, for example the TILF funding. This was attributed to a continuing lack of understanding of the APEC processes and protocol. To assist this process, for APEC projects, a link to the [*Guidebook on APEC Projects*](http://www.apec.org/Projects/~/media/Files/AboutUs/PoliciesandProcedures/2010/APEC_Guidebook_7thed_Oct2010.ashx)has been included for reference. In addition, the FSCF and the FSCF PTIN provide networks of expertise to review and contribute to the development of project proposals.

Another challenge identified by members relates to the FSCF PTIN meetings/workshops. While a number of workshops have been successfully implemented, the style of implementation has been to target a large number of people in conference style workshops. In terms of raising awareness and knowledge of particular issues, this has been very effective; however this style makes it challenging to allow for hands-on learning opportunities. The development of sustainable training modules is under way, but is constrained by resource limitations. Member economies reported that although short courses are beneficial, the volume of information provided in a short time hinders full understanding and sustained learning. It was suggested that to maximise the benefit of capacity building activities, follow up workshops would be useful, particularly with the provision of ongoing support to participants. Feedback from member economies on the first few FSCF PTIN modules will be useful.

It was suggested that master classes and staff interchanges should be more actively encouraged.

 **2.4 Coordination of the implementation of the FSCF goals**

As was noted in the *2009 Review of Progress*, a key challenge had been to coordinate the implementation of FSCF goals and priorities across all 21 member economies with recognition that to make the FSCF successful, involvement from all member economies is essential. Coordinated and systematic progression of the work of the FSCF and the agreed priorities requires officials from all member economies, particularly developing APEC member economies, to be involved on a consistent basis. In general, it was noted that prioritising resources to enable active involvement with the FSCF is a challenge for some economies.

**2.5 Interagency cooperation**

In many economies, several agencies share the responsibility for food safety regulation. A lack of coordination amongst relevant agencies presents as a common challenge for many of these economies with an overlap and/or duplication of functions occurring between different agencies involved in the food safety system. Attempting to undertake internal activities as well as activities associated with the FSCF is difficult when there is an unclear delineation of duties and responsibilities amongst domestic agencies responsible for food safety. In some cases, there is also a lack of high level support relating to food safety.

In terms of raising support in this area, the SCSC has been advancing implementation by member economies of good regulatory practices for more than a decade, including most recently at the Sixth Conference on Good Regulatory Practice, where internal coordination of regulatory work was identified as a priority.  Immediately following, APEC Senior Officials endorsed specific proposals on Good Regulatory Practice and Regulatory Cooperation coordination. The APEC-OECD Integrated Regulatory Checklist also highlights the importance of inter-ministerial mechanisms to manage and coordinate regulatory reform. In 2011 and moving forward, there will be high level emphasis on strengthening implementation of good regulatory practices in APEC Economies.

**3. Proposed Key Directions to be taken by the FSCF**

### 3.1 Information sharing and communication/networking (Goal 1)

The establishment of the FSCF and its PTIN websites has improved communication and information sharing across the region. It is proposed that work continues to promote accessible and effective information about key food safety issues, including case studies of progress made within member economies to advance FSCF goals, across all FSCF member economies.

Particular areas noted were the need for member economies to build on their current communication networks and achievements in sharing relevant risk assessment/risk management/risk communication information in a food emergency situation. It was noted that this could include a list of accessible FSCF contact points with specific areas of responsibility/expertise noted. For example, this could include the first point of contact in the event of a food emergency.

### 3.2 Food safety regulatory systems that are consistent with WTO SPS/TBT Agreements and are harmonised, to the extent possible, with international standards (Goal 2)

It is suggested that work continues to implement the recommendations of the Discussion Paper on maximum residue limits and identify other areas where greater alignment of standards will improve food safety and facilitate trade.

Given the challenges expressed in the broad area of food inspection and certification systems, it is proposed that the FSCF increase its focus in this area. The FSCF PTIN Export Certification Round Table was held in Australia in 2010, to provide a forum for both government and industry representatives from APEC Member Economies to discuss common issues and concerns related to export certificates. This led to a common understanding that additional work regarding the issuance and usage of official certificates was needed. The initial Round Table developed a common understanding of “best practices” for appropriate use of export certificates. In addition, the APEC Member Economies identified several options to streamline the certificate process across the APEC region. As a next step, the United States plans to convene a Working Group of experts to: 1) provide technical assistance on avoiding unnecessary certificate requirements; 2) how to use the Codex Generic Model Official Certificate Annex to the Codex Guidelines for Design, Production, Issuance and Use of Generic Official Certificates (CAC/GL 38-2001) when developing or modifying certificate requirements; and 3) discuss the benefits of electronic certification.

Several economies suggested that it would be beneficial to repeat the capacity building activity on *Capacity Building Needs of National Food Control Systems in APEC Developing Economies* and/or to conduct national assessments to identify gaps in food safety systems. Given the positive impact previously attributed to this activity, it is proposed that some level of priority be given to this in the future and that consideration be given to how this could capacity building tool could be developed into a sustainable training module.

In terms of the challenges faced by many member economies in the area of interagency cooperation, this could be an area where some economies could share information on how their food control/regulatory systems operate, with particular emphasis on cooperation at the jurisdictional/agency level.

### 3.3 Enhanced skills and human resource capacities (Goal 3)

The progress made on delivering capacity building activities has been very successful and a significant achievement for the FSCF, the FSCF PTIN, the Specialist Regional Bodies, APEC member economies and associated organisations. The focus on capacity building around agreed principles and practices has largely been based on the principle that increased capacity would assist in the development/adoption and implementation of standards and systems that support use of international best practice. This emphasis is still considered relevant.

For the immediate future, it is proposed that the FSCF continues efforts to engage with donor organizations, including international financial institutions and development banks. Advancing the partnership and the forward work plan between the FSCF/PTIN and the World Bank, would contribute to ensuring the FSCF/PTIN achieves a sustainable resource base to assist in implementation of forward work plans. A significant outcome in this regard is the proposed signing of an APEC/World Bank Memorandum of Understanding which not only strengthens the relationship between the Bank and APEC, but also calls for additional support from the private sector in capacity building activities. In addition to the agreement with the World Bank, to advance efforts in capacity building across the region, increased participation from the private sector and academia is strongly encouraged.

It has been recommended that a key area of focus for future capacity building under the FSCF/PTIN be laboratory capacity. This would include strengthening laboratory capacity through reference to internationally recognised protocols and validated methods; improving the testing competence of food testing laboratories in APEC economies; and enhancing technical competence across APEC economies. It is considered that work in this area would contribute significantly to assisting in the facilitation of trade and in ensuring that food safety protocols are properly validated throughout the supply chain. As an alternative way of addressing laboratory capacity needs, it has been proposed that given the resource and infrastructure requirements necessary to undertake laboratory operations, that member economies may consider sharing test results in a similar way that risk assessment outcomes could be shared.

It was noted that minimal work had been done to address the broad capacity building area of food inspection and certification systems (although noting the PTIN Export Certification Roundtable had taken place). Given this, it would be seen as beneficial to progress further work in this area. To this end, the United States plans to convene a Working Group of experts in 2011 to: 1) provide technical assistance on avoiding unnecessary certificate requirements; 2) how to use the Codex Generic Model Official Certificate Annex to the Codex Guidelines for Design, Production, Issuance and Use of Generic Official Certificates (CAC/GL 38-2001) when developing or modifying certificate requirements; and 3) discuss the benefits of electronic certification.

In terms of addressing a number of the challenges reported by member economies with respect to limited resources within individual economies to undertake capacity building activities, the work to be undertaken between the World Bank and the FSCF on assessing scalable approaches to improve food safety systems, is intended to assist this. In this work, it is planned that the World Bank will work closely with the FSCF and the FSCF PTIN to identify, characterize and assess scalable approaches to improving food safety systems. Emphasis would be placed on awareness-raising; best practices in public-private collaboration; and capacity-building within the public sector, private industry, and not-for-profit organizations involved in food safety.

It has been suggested that staff exchanges, such as the exchanges undertaken between Australia and China, as described in Section 1.2 above, be undertaken on a more regular basis. It is proposed that this type of activity be undertaken on a bilateral basis, with the exchange tailored to meet the needs of both the staff member and the host organisation and member economy.

### 3.4 Coordination of the implementation of FSCF Goals and the its PTIN

To promote progress towards the goals of the FSCF, it has been recommended that more active participation and leadership by all member economies, be encouraged.

The FSCF PTIN has provided a mechanism to more actively engage experts from academia and food industry, however there is still work to be continued in developing a more consistent and transparent information flow. Emphasis should be placed on continuing to link the FSCF and its PTIN with key regional/international organisations including the World Bank, the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) to ensure effective collaboration and a partnership approach to addressing agreed food safety capacity building priorities. To enhance the operation of the PTIN, as agreed when it was established, a revision of the PTIN Steering Group Terms of Reference has been undertaken in the lead up to the FSCF 2011 events. This review aims to enhance the operation of the Steering Group by refining the PTIN goals and strengthening the membership base of the Steering Group.

Members have recommended that the FSCF continue to work to ensure that food safety is always considered a key element of food security.

**Recommendations for future action from 2011 – 2013**

1. Build on already established communication networks and processes, specifically by:
	1. Continuing to promote access to FSCF/PTIN documents, reports of food safety capacity building activities and, where appropriate, training materials via the FSCF and FSCF PTIN websites;
	2. Sharing information on emerging food safety issues and during food safety emergencies, particularly by supporting the newly established FSCF Food Safety Incident Network;
	3. Engaging all member economies more fully in the work of the FSCF and its PTIN.
2. Continue to strengthen the coordination and implementation of food safety capacity building activities that support sustainable learning outcomes, utilising a broad range of government, industry and academic stakeholders. To advance this, the FSCF PTIN will develop a 2-3 year strategic work plan, to be implemented with its partners, including the World Bank.
3. Continuing to focus on priority food safety capacity building needs, consistent with the agreed FSCF Capacity Building Priority Areas, particularly in the areas of:
	1. food inspection and certification systems;
	2. risk analysis;
	3. laboratory capacity; and
	4. identifying and addressing gaps in economy level food safety systems.
4. Work towards a sustainable resource base for implementing capacity building activities through collaboration with relevant international and regional organisations, with donor organisations and with the private sector.
5. Support the implementation of the agreed recommendations regarding the pilot project for promoting harmonization of pesticide maximum residue limits in the APEC region; reduce unnecessary certificate requirements and advance harmonization of export certificates to Codex Guidelines; and identify additional areas where convergence on food safety standards and systems can be progressed*.*

**Attachment 1**

The following table outlines key activities that have been undertaken to address each of the recommendations and the impact of the activity.

| **FSCF 2009 Recommendation** | **Activity undertaken** | **Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Communication networks/processes****a) Establishment of expert databases** | * FSCF PTIN Expert Working Group on Food Safety, May 2010
 | * Establishment of database of government, industry and academic professionals with expertise in food safety and training.
 |
| **1. Communication networks/processes****b) Information sharing in food emergencies** | * FSCF PTIN Managing Food Safety Incident Workshop, May 2011
* Establishment of alert systems internally in several member economies such as Food Alert System of Thailand (FAST).
* Development of National Protocols/Guidelines including data management systems for Food Incident Response (Malaysia)
 | * Capacity building in incident management and establishment of FSCF Food Safety Incident Group
* To provide coordination in order to recognize and resolve problems in time and could be used as a database for monitoring food safety issues.
* Better response and coordination during crises
 |
| **1. Communication networks/processes****c) Participation in INFOSAN** | * FSCF PTIN Managing Food Safety Incident Workshop, May 2011
* Establishment of national INFOSAN committee in Malaysia and Thailand.
 | * Active encouragement of participation in INFOSAN
* Improved coordination with INFOSAN
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Focus on priority food safety capacity building needs as outlined in the FSCF *Capacity Building Priority Areas*** | * A range of capacity building activities undertaken by the FSCF and the PTIN in response to identified priority areas. See the *Implementation Plan and Record of Activities 2007-2013* for details of activities.
* National Priorities for Malaysia developed using APEC capacity building prioritization as backdrop
* A range of capacity building activities undertaken to address a variety of the agreed priorities, specifically relating to the needs of official inspectors (Peru)
 | * Improved awareness, knowledge and skills in relation to specific capacity building areas.
* Strengthening of food safety programs with improved harmonisation with international systems and processes
* Intervention approach standardised and number of food borne outbreaks decreased.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Strengthen coordination and implementation of food safety capacity building activities using broad range of stakeholders through FSCF PTIN.** | * FSCF PTIN work in a number of key identified areas such as: Risk Analysis, Export Certificates, Incident Management, Supply Chain Management, and Laboratory Capacity Building (commencing work in 2011).
* Review of PTIN Steering Group to ensure optimum effectiveness
 | * Development of a road map of actions to improve the availability, accessibility, and use of food safety training materials based on international standards and best practices.
* Improve understandings and application of best practices and innovative technologies in supply chain management and implementation of a food safety plan.
* As a result of the Export Certification Roundtable dialogue, a number of possible next steps were identified, including: the possibility of APEC providing technical assistance on avoiding unnecessary certificate requirements; a project on “how the Generic Model Official Certificate Annex to the Codex Guidelines for Design, Production, Issuance and Use of Generic Official Certificates (CAC/GL 38-2001) can be more broadly utilized among APEC Member Economies”; a project on enhancing the use of electronic certification in the APEC region; a broad review of APEC certification requirements for food to establish a baseline for proposing that CCFICS consider additional work on incorporating appropriate attestations in the generic model certificate.
* Outcomes from the Supply Chain Management workshop in Beijing will be developed into the first 2 FSCF PTIN reproducible training modules for wider dissemination of the supply chain and aquaculture training.
* Effective, high level guidance to PTIN.
 |
| **4. Transfer success in capacity building to alignment of food safety standards and systems.** | * Development of Discussion Paper on Harmonisation of Standards on Maximum Residue Limits.
* National Technical Committees established to align standards, procedures and systems with International standards (Malaysia)
* Established HACCP certification and GMP Guidelines (Malaysia)
* Establishment of Risk Management Committee (Malaysia)
* FSCF PTIN Export Certification Roundtable
 | * FSCF agreement on forward recommendations
* Greater commitment by industry to comply with international standards. Harmonisation of national standards, systems and procedures with international standards.
* Systems more aligned to international guidelines.
* Improved mechanisms for standards development
* Further work to be undertaken on how APEC can provide technical assistance on avoiding unnecessary certificate requirements
 |