



Asia-Pacific
Economic Cooperation

**APEC MRA-HRD Project: Training Program for
Phase II Implementation Final Report**

**Telecommunications and Information Working
Group**

January 2006

**APEC MRA-HRD Project: Training Program for
Phase II Implementation Final Report**

**Telecommunications and Information Working
Group**

**MRA Task Force and
Human Resource Development Steering Group
January 2006**

**Published by Treuhaft & Associates
January 2006**

First edition, January 2006

PUBLISHED BY Treuhaft & Associates

Email: treuhaj@algonquincollege.com

FOR THE ASIA PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION SECRETARIAT

35 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119616

Tel: (65) 6775-6012 Fax (65) 6775-6013

Email: info@apec.org

Website: www.apec.org

© 2006 APEC Secretariat

APEC Publication Number APEC #206-TC-01.1

CONTENTS

SECTION	Page Number
<i>Executive Summary</i>	7
<i>Introduction</i>	9
<i>Phase II MRA Training Workshop</i>	10
<i>Phase I experiences</i>	10
General Summary of Feedback	11
Specific Feedback Issues	12
<i>Phase II Experiences</i>	13
Hong Kong, China	13
USA	15
Chinese Taipei	17
Singapore	18
Canada	19
<i>Implementation Steps</i>	22
<i>Information storage and sharing</i>	24
Recommendation to MRATF	24
<i>Workshop Outcomes</i>	24
<i>Attachment</i>	27
Workshop Agenda	

Executive Summary

The main objectives of the APEC MRA Phase II Implementation workshop were to:

1. build confidence in economies implementing Phase Two;
2. present and review Phase One implementations experiences;
3. exchange explicit knowledge about regulatory structures and requirements that effect Phase Two implementation;
4. exchange tacit knowledge including interpretations and any unwritten extra requirements or explanations for Phase Two implementation; and
5. discuss storage, access and maintenance of information

The workshop, held in the TOT Academy training facilities, had 26 participants from nine economies. The workshop consisted of presentations from each of the five economies currently involved in Phase II as well as presentations on background to the MRA, Phase I, Phase II and the ASEAN MRA. These detailed presentations are provided in full on the APEC TEL website found at

www.apectelwg.org

The full presentations contain a wealth of information on technical, procedural and experiential information regarding Phase I and II implementation. This Final Report also contains a review of the implementation status reported by the participants. (Note that the MRA Task Force is currently surveying all economies to obtain a more complete and official understanding of Phase I and II implementation status.)

It was clear from the evaluations that participants gained a great deal of knowledge from this workshop. While primarily focused on Phase II implementation, participants were able to resolve a large number of problems related to pre and Phase I implementation. They also greatly benefited from the help of Phase II “experts” who also learned a great deal from each other. The nature of the small group discussion allowed participants to share their own stories, problems, frustrations, and successes with their colleagues. This networking proved to be a valuable implementation support tool.

In the early days of the MRA it was anticipated that a major obstacle to successful implementation would be the tacit knowledge that local CABs possessed that foreign CABs did not. This however, does not seem to be the case. Economies have addressed this issue through extensive use of web sites, formal and informal training, and well informed contacts. A number of times participants noted that technical issues were not barriers to implementation.

There were, however, a number of real barriers facing economies who have not yet achieved either Phase I or Phase II implementation including:

- Lack of human resources (too few people – too much work)
- Legislative changes (only required in a few economies)
- Acquiring inter-departmental agreements and cooperation (slowly being resolved)
- Identifying the benefits of participating, especially for non-exporting economies (still an issue for many)
- Concerns of local CABs who feel they might be losing business
- The need to develop new accreditation, designation and enforcement processes and documentation (new for many and complicated)
- Incomplete technical regulations (due to rapid changes in emergent technologies)

During this workshop a number of solutions were discussed to address these barriers. Armed with these ideas, participants stated they were better prepared to move forward.

The issue of storage, access and maintenance of information was addressed during the workshop. Participants came to the following conclusion:

There should be a single simple MRA webpage. There should be links to

- The MRA Task Force (which should archive all documents)
- A table of Notifications to the TEL Chair of Readiness
- Annexes I-IV by economy divided by Phase I and II
- Each economy's main MRA website.

This webpage should be prominently displayed on the APEC TEL website. This regime would keep complicated updates to a minimum (see the ASEAN MRA website at <http://www.aseanconnect.gov.my>).

At the present time there are no proposals for additional training workshops to assist in the implementation of the MRA. It is apparent from the results of this workshop that many economies still in the early stages of implementation will continue to need support as they progress. The form of that assistance can best be determined by discussions with those persons within each economy who are actually responsible for implementation. The MRATF would be a good vehicle to coordinate and develop future support activities.

Introduction

In June 1998 the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Telecommunications and Information Ministers launched a unique initiative with its Mutual Recognition Arrangement for Conformity Assessment of Telecommunications Equipment (MRA). This MRA culminated three years of work under the Telecommunications and Information Working Group (TEL). It was the first multilateral agreement of its kind in the world.

The purpose of the MRA is to

...facilitate trade by streamlining the conformity assessment procedures for a wide range of telecommunications and telecommunications-related equipment. It provides for the mutual recognition by the importing parties of conformity assessment bodies and mutual acceptance of the results of testing and equipment certification procedures undertaken by those bodies in assessing conformity of equipment to the importing parties' own technical regulations (8 May 1998, MRA Document).

The MRA Document spells out the complete arrangement including scope, terms, definitions, requirements, and procedures necessary for implementation. The MRA includes two Phases. Phase I allows for the mutual recognition of conformity assessment testing by approved conformity assessment bodies in the exporting economy while Phase II allows for the mutual recognition of equipment certification by approved bodies in an exporting economy.

The TELs Liberalization Steering Group (LSG) set up a standing MRA Task Force (MRATF) to develop and implement the MRA. The MRATF has been extremely active in designing, fine tuning and supporting the implementation of the MRA.

Given the complexity of the MRA, APEC TEL has supported three specific projects designed to assist APEC economies with implementation. The first project was the MRA Implementation Project which consisted of individual consultations with economies to determine ways to best proceed for each individual economy. Additional recommendations were made to the MRATF to facilitate implementation. A workshop was held in Cha Am, Thailand to further support successful implementation of the MRA. The second project was the Phase I MRA Training Project. This project consisted of two MRA training workshops held in Thailand and Chinese Taipei. The third project was the APEC MRA-HRD Training Project on Phase II implementation. This training workshop was held in Bangkok, Thailand 12 – 16 December 2005.

The Phase II MRA Training Workshop:

The five objectives of the workshop were to:

1. build confidence in economies implementing Phase Two;
2. present and review Phase One implementations experiences;
3. exchange explicit knowledge about regulatory structures and requirements that effect Phase Two implementation;
4. exchange tacit knowledge including interpretations and any unwritten extra requirements or explanations for Phase Two implementation; and
5. discuss storage, access and maintenance of information

The workshop, held in the TOT Academy training facilities, had 26 participants from nine economies including Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, China, Malaysia, the People 's Republic of China, Philippines, Thailand, and the USA. While representatives from Singapore (an active Phase II economy) were unable to participate due to exigency of service, information from IDA's website was used in the presentation.

The workshop consisted of presentations from each of the five economies currently involved in Phase II as well as presentations on background to the MRA, Phase I, Phase II and the ASEAN MRA. The workshop program is included at the end of this report.

The workshop began with an introduction to MRAs in general, followed by a general introduction to Phase I of the MRA. Small group discussions were ensued to allow participants to share experiences and to identify specific needs. Given the common issues and language shared by the participants two groups emerged. One of the discussion groups consisted primarily of APEC economies that are also involved in the ASEAN MRA and the other group consisted of PRC, Chinese Taipei, and Hong Kong China. Each group including Australia, Canada, and the USA contributed to the following section.

Phase I experiences

The participants in this workshop represented economies in all stages of implementation including some who have not yet implemented Phase I, some who have implemented Phase I but not Phase II, and some who have implemented Phase II. Some economies indicated that they had implemented Phase I but were not intending to Phase II.

The two groups were asked to identify issues that presented problems for them in the Phase I implementation process.

General Summary of Feedback:

Some economies had concerns about the benefits of implementation. The benefits appear to be clear for economies that export equipment but not for economies that only import equipment. A number of real benefits for importing economies were presented including shorter time to market, foreign CABs can help smaller economies assess new devices, and benefits to the end user. It was also pointed out that some benefits may not be immediately available and may take several years to realize.

A number of test labs (CABs) are not convinced of the value of the MRA and the associated costs. While some labs are looking forward to being involved in the MRA other labs are concerned they will be replaced by foreign labs. It was pointed out that this has not happened in economies that have already implemented the MRA. It was also noted that some CABs have become certification bodies generating new revenue. CABs may also develop training and consulting programs that generate new revenue as a result of the MRA (the information, especially tacit knowledge that a local lab has is very valuable to foreign CABs who are willing to pay to obtain it).

All economies agreed that there were no technical barriers to implementation. Barriers were either political or administrative. Political problems included poor support, unrealistic expectations, and multi agency authority. For some economies the MRA is not their highest priority. In other economies Ministers would like the MRA implemented immediately and don't understand the timeline issues associated with proper implementation. The most difficult problem to solve, however, is the one caused by delays when multiple departments or ministries share the regulatory authority under the MRA. Those implementing the MRA are usually not in a position to influence the agreement process. This causes frustration for those seeking to move forward.

Administrative problems included lack of human resources within the department, unclear understanding of the time required for each implementation step, and the need to revise and update documentation. While it is not possible to provide help for a one or two persons department, much discussion ensued about the time required for each step of implementation. An entire discussion session was devoted to identifying implementation steps and setting realistic times to achieve each task.

Several other issues arose – standards equivalence was a concern as was document translation, however these were minor concerns. It was pointed out that neither equivalence nor translation into a specific language was a part of the MRA.

No one identified legal issues as a problem. All participant economies had the legal authority to implement the MRA.

Several issues arose related to the workload associated with implementation. For example, procedures have to be established for the designation process, the designation process must take place, accreditation bodies must be selected, websites have to be updated, training sessions have to be planned, etc. For some economies undergoing other liberalization activities, e.g. setting up a new regulator, the limited human resources available will impact the pace of implementation.

For both Phase I and Phase II, economies have to identify the scope of recognition that they will allow under the MRA. Some economies are dealing with how wide the scope should be in light of the number and kinds of equipment they either export and/or import. Similar issues related to testing also arose. To what extent is documentation testing appropriate and when is physical testing required. Discussions and suggestions ensued.

Specific Feedback Issues:

It was noted that the PRC is now ready to enter Phase I. Hong Kong, China and Chinese Taipei are already in Phase I and have signed arrangements with several economies.

At the outset of the workshop, ASEAN/APEC economies indicated that due to foreign/ Government policy, they will implement the ASEAN MRA before implementing the APEC MRA. It should be noted that the two MRAs are almost identical. The main difference lies in the management of the process rather than the actual wording of the arrangement. Details of the ASEAN MRA can be found at:

<http://www.aseanconnect.gov.my>

Singapore has implemented both Phases of the MRA and is playing a leading role in implementing ASEAN's MRA. Other economies about to implement Phase I are Brunei, Indonesia, and Malaysia. Brunei is in the process of setting up a testing lab and is reviewing its technical regulations. Indonesia is translating its technical regulations into English. Malaysia is dealing with time constraints in the implementation process itself.

These economies noted that they need to evaluate which technical regulations should be included in the accreditation scope based on analyses of what is commercially viable. It was also noted that the accreditation process is complicated. Labs need time to become familiar

with the process, the technical regulations, etc. before becoming accredited. These economies are also working on strategies to encourage labs to expedite the process.

There is still a lot of discussion about whether trade volumes among these economies warrant an MRA and related research is ongoing as well as the possibility of adopting a common set of standards.

Phase II experiences

Each economy currently involved in Phase II presented a detailed description of its technical standards, regulations and procedures. They also presented information regarding bringing products to market; performance of CAB's; testing and acceptance of test reports; and people and skill issues. Detailed information is provided in the full presentations available on the APEC TEL website (www.apectelwg.org). For complete and detailed information please refer to the actual presentations.

The following are selected points from the five Phase II presentations.

Hong Kong, China

An active Phase I participant Hong Kong, China has recognised a number of foreign CABs.

MRA Partner	No. of Hong Kong Labs. recognised
Canada	1
Singapore	1

MRA Partner	No of Labs recognised by OFTA
Singapore	1
Chinese Taipei	3
Canada	1
USA	1

Letters of exchange for Phase II have been completed with the USA. Note that letters of exchange are an option in the MRA. Currently only the USA requires such letters.

All information, including tacit knowledge is available from OFTA. Most of this information is posted on its website.

OFTA recognises the following testing laboratories as Recognised Testing Agencies to perform testing of equipment to technical requirements of Hong Kong, China:

- Local testing laboratories accredited by Hong Kong Accreditation Service (HKAS)
- Testing laboratories accredited by overseas accreditation body having MRA with HKAS
- Overseas testing laboratories recognised by member countries of OECD
- Testing laboratories designated by member economies of APEC

The criteria, requirements and procedures for the recognition of foreign certification body (FCB) by OFTA are being drafted. They will become operational shortly.

Post market surveillance in Hong Kong, China is mandatory. While this is outside of the MRA, the surveillance need not take place within the importing economy.

Foreign CABs and other interested parties can register for email alerts informing them of changes in regulations or other requirements.

OFTA will post all the necessary information related to the implementation of Phase II MRA on a dedicated webpage in its website. Certification body in APEC economies can refer to the documents posted therein for details on the procedures, criteria, regulations and standards stipulated by OFTA for the recognition of certification body. Economies can also approach OFTA to ask for further details or in-depth knowledge on OFTA regulations, standards and any issues related to the implementation of MRA using any means of communications as provided in the key contacts.

In reviewing its Phase I and II implementation it was felt that all barriers to implementation were political. There were no technical barriers and there was little impact on OFTA resources.

Key Contacts

Senior Telecommunications Engineer
Standards Section
Office of the Telecommunications Authority
29/F Wu Chung House
213 Queen's Road East
Wanchai, Hong Kong
Tel : +852 2961 6628
Fax : + 852 2838 5004
E-mail : standards@ofta.gov.hk
website : www.ofta.gov.hk

Technical Regulations

<http://www.ofta.gov.hk/en/standards/HKTASpec/hkta-spec.html>

EMC Requirements

<http://www.ofta.gov.hk/en/ta-regulations/es22005090922.pdf>

Interference Control Regulations

<http://www.legislation.gov.hk/eng/home.htm>

List of registered Recognised Testing Agencies

<http://www.ofta.gov.hk/en/tec/rtalist.html>

USA

All test procedures can be obtained from the FCC web site or knowledge database. It is not a complete list of procedures. CABs may have to ask in advance before they test products.

FCC rules state basic requirements which can be interpreted so long as they are within the rules. These interpretations can be found in the knowledge database.

FCC rules change very frequently. It is up to the TCB to stay current keeping an eye on websites that indicate such changes (changes to the rules are published in the Federal Register available on the web and in print.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is the Regulator Authority and Recognition Authority responsible for non-public telecommunications in the USA. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) is the USA designating authority. The FCC utilizes Telecommunications Certification Bodies (TCBs). Foreign entities may become a TCB in accordance with the terms of a government-to-government Mutual Recognition Agreement/Arrangement. The use of private Certification Bodies (TCBs) has the benefit of reducing product time to market and allowing the FCC to better utilize its resources.

The USA uses the following accrediting bodies: American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for Certification Bodies and American Association for Laboratory Accreditation (A2LA) and National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP) of NIST for accrediting test laboratories.

The USA has had considerable MRA implementation success.

Economy	<u>Phase I</u>	<u>Phase II</u>
Canada	2000	2004
Chinese Taipei	2000	?
Singapore	2000	2005
Hong Kong, China	2000	2005
Australia	2000	NA
United States	2000	2000
Korea	2005	2006?
Japan	2005	2006?

In developing Phase I and II arrangements, communications between all parties and stakeholders was critical, albeit time consuming.

Web sites:

Main FCC Site

www.fcc.gov

FCC Rules:

<http://wireless.fcc.gov/rules.html>

Electronic Documents Management Site:

Rulemakings, public notices and news release information

http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/SilverStream/Pages/edocs.html

Knowledge Database:

Searching and asking questions not specific to a pending or granted FCCID, but related to the equipment authorization process

www.fcc.gov/labhelp

FCC Equipment Authorization Sites:

<https://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/oet/cf/eas/index.cfm>

<https://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/oet/cf/eas/index.cfm>

TCB Equipment Authorization Sites:

<https://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/oetwl/index.html>
<https://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/oetwl/index.html>

Measurement Techniques:

<http://www.fcc.gov/oet/ea/eameasurements.html>

Status Check of Sites:

www.fcc.gov/e-filing

Federal Register Updates:

http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?sid=e4d59e3b2533947b8dd7309ce6675dd7&c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfr/browse/Title47/47cfrv1_02.tpl

NIST MRA

<http://ts.nist.gov/mra>

Chinese Taipei

Chinese Taipei has also been an active Phase I and Phase II participant. All technical regulations, procedures, and documents can be found on the DGT website. However, information relating to mandatory product surveillance is not on the website and can be obtained directly from DGT. DGT is actively using the Internet to expedite many conformity assessment transactions.

APEC Economy	# of Foreign Testing Labs Recognized by DGT			
	Labs	TTE	RF	EMC
USA	6	3	5	
Canada	5	2		5
Australia	1			1
Singapore	1			1

APEC Economy	# of Domestic Labs Recognized by APEC Economies			
	Labs	TTE	RF	EMC
USA	4	4		
Canada	6	6		
Australia	5	2	2	4
Hong Kong, China	3	3	1	
Singapore	4	4	2	3

The Regulatory Authority and Designating Authority is the Directorate General of Telecommunications (DGT). The Testing Lab Accreditation Body is the TAF/CNLA. The product Certification Accreditation Body is the TAF/CNAB.

Chinese Taipei requires all Regulatory Conformity Bodies (CABs) to set up their own electronic filing systems (EFS) by the end of 2005. Four domestic RCBs have completed the establishment of their own EFS and have started to accept application for compliance approval via Internet.

ADT: [http:// www.adt.com.tw](http://www.adt.com.tw)
 CCS: [http:// rcb.ccsemc.com.tw](http://rcb.ccsemc.com.tw)
 TL: [http:// ttc.chttl.com.tw](http://ttc.chttl.com.tw)
 ETC: [http:// www.etc.org.tw](http://www.etc.org.tw)

DGT website:

www.dgt.gov.tw

Contact person:

Email: James@dgt.gov.tw

Singapore

While a representative from Singapore was not present at the workshop, the project managers used information from IDA to discuss the Singapore experience. Since a representative from Singapore was involved in the Phase I training the project managers were familiar with some of the issues Singapore faced. In addition, many of the participants work closely with Singapore in implementing the ASEAN MRA. All of this lead to a productive discussion of Singapore's Phase II experiences.

Singapore has an excellent website which contains all of its technical regulations, procedures, and application forms. The website also provides viewers with current updates.

The Regulatory Authority and Designating Authority is the Infocomm Development Authority of Singapore (IDA). The Accreditation body is the Singapore Accreditation Council (SAC - SINGLAS). The Conformity Assessment Body is PSB Corporation.

Main IDA website:

<http://www.ida.gov.sg>

IDA's MRA website:

<http://www.ida.gov.sg/idaweb/pnr/infopage.jsp?infopagecategory=factsheet:aboutida&infopageid=I3401IDA's>

Schemes and Technical regulations:

<http://www.ida.gov.sg/idaweb/pnr/index.jsp>

Import, Export, Trans-shipment Procedures and List of HS Codes of products:

<http://www.tradenet.gov.sg>

Canada

Canada is currently participating in both phases of the APEC MRA as well as a number of other international MRAs. Industry Canada is the Regulatory Authority and Designating Authority. The Canadian Accreditation Body is the Standards Council of Canada.

Canada faced the following challenges with implementation. Required changes in regulations produced unforeseen delays. The exchange of procedures with MRA partners also took more time than expected. The first designation and recognition agreements were slow and required a lot of cooperation from the partners. Information sessions for CBs were found to be necessary.

Canada also found that their procedures need fine-tuning as experience is gained. There is a need to keep track of MRA transactions. Finally, the MRA process is working and the benefits are real. It is well worth it.
Certification Bodies Recognised by Industry Canada

MRA Partner	# of CBs recognised by IC
USA	12
European Union	4
Canada	1

71% of radio equipment certificates are issued by recognized CBs.

Web Sites:

Radiocommunication and Telecommunications Acts:

<http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/SSG/sf01360e.html>

Spectrum Management and Telecommunications:

<http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/spectrum>

MRAs in which Canada participates (Note: web addresses are case sensitive):

<http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/MRA>

Procedures for Conformity Assessment Bodies:

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/en/h_sf06138e.html

List of Conformity Assessment Bodies:

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inceb-bhst.nsf/en/h_tt00039e.html

MRA discussion Forum:

<http://ssf.scc.ca/forums/tapac/dispatch.cgi>

Radio Equipment List (REL):

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inceb-bhst.nsf/en/h_tt00020e.html

Terminal Equipment List (TEL):

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inceb-bhst.nsf/en/h_tt00050e.html

E-Filing:

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inceb-bhst.nsf/en/h_tt00052e.html

List of recognized CBs

http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/inceb-bhst.nsf/en/h_tt00039e.html

Implementation Steps

In a small group discussion session participants addressed the implementation steps required to begin Phase II of the MRA. Their responses are summarized in the charts below.

#	Implementation Steps	Chinese Taipei	PRC	Philippines	Canada Singapore USA
1.	Develop certification program and establish mechanism for labeling and enforcement of rules (if necessary).		Not involved in either Phases yet but will be very soon	Ongoing, expected to be finished by Dec 2006	All steps done
2.	Obtain legislative authority (if necessary) to implement acceptance of test reports and grants of certification from domestic and foreign test labs and CBs.			Reviewing existing laws	
3.	Develop regulations to privatize approval of products for the domestic products.			Expected Q3 2006	
4.	Develop program for accrediting test labs and CBs. ABs must meet ISO/IEC Guides 58 and/or 61.				
5.	Develop program for accrediting CBs per ISO/IEC Guide 65 for both domestic and foreign technical regulations. CBs may also be required to meet ISO/IEC Standard 17025.				
6.	Develop criteria for determining competence of both test labs and CBs for all types of equipment.				
7.	Identify organization and set-up mechanism for designating domestic and foreign CABs			NTC	
8.	Identify and set-up mechanism for recognizing domestic and foreign CABs			NTC	
9.	Identify and set-up mechanism for making all pertinent technical regulations, interpretations and procedures available to all parties.			Expected Q3 2006 depending on manpower	
10.	Establish necessary training programs for implementation of MRA	.Needs to be developed		No plans	
11.	Establish program for ensuring consistency among all test labs and CBs.	Needs to be developed		No plans	
12.	Identify potential economies that will need an exchange of letters to implement Phase 2 of the APEC Tel MRA. Negotiate the appropriate language for the letters.	Needs to be developed		Phase I expected by Q3 2006	
13.	Develop program for monitoring the performance of domestic and foreign CABs.	Needs to be developed		Expected by Q3 2006	
14.	Develop program for monitoring products			Expected by Q3 2006	

#	Implementation Steps	Malaysia	Thailand	Hong Kong, China
1.	Develop certification program and establish mechanism for labeling and enforcement of rules (if necessary).	Phase I complete Phase II expected in 6-12 months	Not formally initiated Phase I yet. Expects 3-5 years more to get to Phase II. Looking at a 3 year period to complete tasks 4&5 and 7, 8 &	Done
2.	Obtain legislative authority (if necessary) to implement acceptance of test reports and grants of certification from domestic and foreign test labs and CBs.	Ongoing – expected within 6 months	Not required	Done
3.	Develop regulations to privatize approval of products for the domestic products.	Possible – current CAB is private	Within 6 months	Done
4.	Develop program for accrediting test labs and CBs. ABs must meet ISO/IEC Guides 58 and/or 61.	Completed – APLAC member and conforms to the guides	Steps 4 and 5 are a challenge due to existing mandates of NAC and TLAS. May take 2 years to resolve	Done
5.	Develop program for accrediting CBs per ISO/IEC Guide 65 for both domestic and foreign technical regulations. CBs may also be required to meet ISO/IEC Standard 17025.	Done		Close to finishing early in 2006
6.	Develop criteria for determining competence of both test labs and CBs for all types of equipment.	Done	Expected within 6 - 12 months	Done
7.	Identify organization and set-up mechanism for designating domestic and foreign CABs	Expected by June 2006		Close to finishing early in 2006
8.	Identify and set-up mechanism for recognizing domestic and foreign CABs	Expected by June 2006		Close to finishing early in 2006
9.	Identify and set-up mechanism for making all pertinent technical regulations, interpretations and procedures available to all parties.	Done		Done
10.	Establish necessary training programs for implementation of MRA.	Expected to take all of 2006	Intensive training needed during first six months, then less often as needed	Not required due to website.
11.	Establish program for ensuring consistency among all test labs and CBs.	Expected within 6 -12 months		Done
12.	Identify potential economies that will need an exchange of letters to implement Phase 2 of the APEC Tel MRA. Negotiate the appropriate language for the letters.	Expected by June 2006		Done
13.	Develop program for monitoring the performance of domestic and foreign CABs.	Expected within 6 months	Under consideration	
14.	Develop program for monitoring products	Done	Under consideration	

Information storage and sharing

A free ranging discussion was held regarding information sharing and storage needs. It was noted that the official MRAMS website has not been updated for a while. It was also pointed out that economies that use MRAMS would have to update information twice – once on their own websites and a second time on MRAMS. Participants spent a lot of time looking at the ASEAN MRA website hosted by Malaysia and suggested that with the addition of some background information and definitions it would serve the APEC MRA needs very well. Some suggested that each economy should have a single link to its own website from some central APEC TEL webpage.

The MRA requires that information from Annexes I – IV be available to the public and that is not now the case. There is no one site where stakeholders can go to for correct information. In many cases it is not obvious who the contact person is or what the web address is for the designating authority in an economy. Given at least one of these most information can then be readily obtained.

Participants found it difficult to find MRATF documents and suggested that an MRA archive be created including documents going back to the first meeting. This archived website could be hosted by APEC TEL and made available to MRATF members only (see ASEAN Papers section which has restricted access).

Recommendation to the MRATF:

There was consensus for a single simple MRA webpage. There should be links to

- The MRATF
- A table of Notifications to the TEL Chair of Readiness
- Annexes I-IV by economy divided by Phase I and II
- Each economy's main MRA website.

This webpage should be prominently displayed on the APEC TEL website. This regime would keep complicated updates to a minimum (see the ASEAN MRA website at <http://www.aseanconnect.gov.my>).

Workshop outcomes - Overcoming Barriers and Moving Forward

It was clear from the participant evaluations that they gained a great deal of knowledge from this workshop. While primarily focused on Phase II implementation, participants were able to resolve a large number of problems related to pre and Phase I implementation. They also greatly benefited from the help of Phase II “experts” who also learned a great deal from each other.

The nature of the small group discussion allowed participants to share their own stories, problems, frustrations, and successes with their colleagues. This was noted as a particularly attractive part of the training in the evaluations.

A number of issues related to overcoming barriers and moving forward arose during the week. Many basic questions were asked about details and interpretations of the MRA. Given the built in flexibility of the MRA and the diversity among the 21 APEC economies this is not unexpected. The workshop provided a forum to clarify the wording and application of the MRA in a wide variety of contexts helping participants see how they could implement the MRA in their home economy. This kind of basic question and answer session is still required by those economies in the early implementation stages.

In some economies the stakeholders still do not see the benefits of participating in the MRA, especially if they are not exporting economies. Labs may feel threatened while others may question the cost-benefits of an MRA given limited commercial activity. A number of valid benefits were presented and participants left armed with the information to address these concerns. Nevertheless, the perception that the MRA is not necessary remains among many. The MRATF should consider providing additional assistance to those facing this issue.

While most participants were not in a position to influence political delays it was noted that mapping out strategies for higher levels so politicians better understand what needs to be done and what benefits will accrue might be beneficial. Again the MRATF might be able to provide some assistance using a TEL MIN session as a vehicle to discuss successes.

Many economies face uncertainty in moving forward. Participants at this workshop indicated that this was no longer a barrier for them. A number of suggestions to help others were made including:

- Creating clear implementation plans with guidelines and/or roadmaps.
- Use of the Implementation Guidelines found attached to the MRA document might be of assistance.
- Establish timeframes along with stocktaking
- Inform stakeholders of progress on a regular basis so they can make their own plans.

Document development was also a concern to many. Some suggestions include adapting best practices from partner economies; looking to other economies for missing pieces such as monitoring and enforcement procedures.

In the final review session the ASEAN/APEC economies stated that after having completed the workshop they were going to recommend that implementation of the APEC MRA take precedence over the ASEAN MRA. Since these two MRAs are so similar development for one will automatically benefit the other.

Communications between all stakeholders within each economy was discussed and considered necessary for helping all affected parties and ensuring the successful implementation of the MRA.

The usefulness of networking among economies was also discussed. Many of the participants felt that being able to talk to colleagues from other economies in the same situation was of great help. Perhaps one of the best outcomes of this workshop was the information exchange and subsequent learning that took place among the participants themselves.

At the present time there are no proposals for additional training workshops to assist in the implementation of the MRA. It is apparent from the results of this workshop that many economies still in the early stages of implementation will continue to need support as they progress. If the goal of increasing the number of Phase II economies is to be realized then thought should be given to providing additional assistance to those economies. The form of that assistance can best be determined by discussions with those persons within each economy who are actually responsible for implementation. The MRATF would be a good vehicle to coordinate such an activity.

Workshop Agenda

APEC Telecommunications and Information Working Group

APEC TEL MRA Phase II Training Workshop

12 December – 16 December 2005

Bangkok, Thailand

TOT Public Company Training Academy

Monday 12 December 0900 Opening; Introductions; and Introduction to MRA Phase I 1030 Break 1100 Review of Phase I Implementation Status 1230 Lunch 1330 Introduction to Phase II 1500 Break 1530 Review of Phase II Progress 1630 Close	Thursday 15 December 0900 Detailed Phase II Review – Canada 1030 Break 1100 Detailed Phase II Review – Singapore and ASEAN Presentation/Discussion 1230 Lunch 1330 Information sharing sessions/discussion in small groups 1500 Break 1530 Information sharing sessions/discussion in small groups 1630 Close
Tuesday 13 December 0900 Detailed Phase II Review – Hong Kong, China 1030 Break 1100 Detailed Phase II Review – USA 1230 Lunch 1330 Detailed Phase II Review – USA 1500 Break 1530 Detailed Phase II Review – USA 1630 Close	Friday 16 December 0900 Panel Discussion – How to move forward 1030 Break 1100 Overall Review and wrap up 1230 Lunch 1330 Close
Wednesday 14 December 0900 Detailed Phase II Review – Chinese Taipei 1030 Break 1100 Detailed Phase II Review – Chinese Taipei 1230 Lunch 1330 Detailed Phase II Review – Canada 1500 Break 1530 Detailed Phase II Review – Canada 1630 Close	



Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation

Treuhart & Associates

Email: treuhaj@algonquincollege.com

FOR THE ASIA PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION SECRETARIAT

35 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119616

Tel: (65) 6775-6012 Fax (65) 6775-6013

Email: info@appec.org

Website: www.appec.org

© 2006 APEC Secretariat

APEC Publication Number APEC #206-TC-01.1