UNITED NATIONS **E**

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/19
6 April 2010

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

COMMITTEE ON TRADE

Working Party on Regulatory Cooperation and Standardization Policies

Nineteenth session
Geneva, 24-26 November 2009

REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON REGULATORY COOPERATION AND STANDARDIZATION POLICIES ON ITS NINETEENTH SESSION

Summary

At its nineteenth session, the Working Party:

- Agreed to consider establishing a Group of Experts on Risk Assessment and Management (see para. 10).

- Noted the interest of the Russian Federation in promoting information exchange among non-European Union member States concerning their experience in implementing the EU Regulation on Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) (para. 20).

- Asked the secretariat to work with especially appointed coordinators to compile information on regulatory developments in different regions into quarterly reports and a yearly consolidated report (para. 22).

- Approved the Common Regulatory Objectives for the Initiative on Equipment on Explosive Environments, revised the Objectives for the Initiative for Earthmoving Equipment, and approved the terms of reference of the Initiative on the Safety of Pipelines (paras. 36, 41 and 46).

(cont'd)

- Asked member States to provide the secretariat with information on their market surveillance authorities (see para. 52).

- Recommended that the document on the "General Market Surveillance Model" be further developed and used as a training document, and that the one on "Common definitions and terminology in market surveillance" be expanded and used for information (see paras. 64 and 67).

Introduction

1. The Working Party on Regulatory Cooperation and Standardization Policies (WP.6) held its nineteenth session from 23 to 26 November 2009 in Geneva. The meeting also included the Workshop on Practical Application of Risk Assessment and Management (23 November) and the UNECE International Conference on Risk Assessment and Management (24 November and 25 November (a.m.) (see document ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2010/2).

2. The following countries were represented: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil[1], Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt[1], France, Georgia, Germany, Israel, Japan[1], Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico[1], Mozambique[1], New Zealand[1], Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Swaziland[1], Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago[1], Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, and Uzbekistan.

3. The meeting was also attended by representatives of the European Community (EC).

4. The following United Nations bodies and specialized agencies participated: United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and United Nations Office of Internal Oversight services (OIOS).

5. Four intergovernmental organizations attended: Eurasian Interstate Council for Standardization, Metrology and Certification (EASC), International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML), Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and World Trade Organization (WTO).

6. The following non-governmental organizations participated: European Committee for Electrotechnical Standardization (CENELEC), International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO).

[1] Participation under Article 11 of the terms of reference of the Economic Commission for Europe.

7. Observers present at the invitation of the secretariat included representatives of private-sector companies, associations and civil-society organizations from various regions.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/1 – Annotated provisional agenda

8. The Working Party approved the provisional agenda.

II. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

9. In accordance with the Commission's rules of procedure and established practice, the Working Party elected Mr. C. Arvius (Sweden) as Chair, and Mr. V. Koreshkov (Belarus) and Mr. P. Lukac (Slovakia) as vice-chairs.

III. INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON RISK ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/2 - Provisional programme of the Conference

10. Following the recommendations by the Conference on Risk Assessment and Management, the Working Party agreed on the following:

(a) To support already established cooperation in the area of risk assessment and management between authorities and stakeholders, and encourage further cooperation to achieve a shared regulatory framework, i.e. one that meets societal demand without stifling innovation or creating technical barriers to trade;

(b) To continue the dialogue among stakeholders to build an effective regulatory framework, including a common language, to address risks related to products, processes and production methods, best practices in the management of hazards that could cause harm or damage to people, the environment, property and immaterial assets;

(c) To this end, consider establishing a Group of Experts on Risk Assessment and Management, the mandate to be given to such a Group including the priorities related to the work areas of WP.6.

11. The representative of OIML welcomed the proposal, but added that the substantial work on development of tools and recommendations was best carried out with reference to a specific field, or sector.

IV. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRADE AND THE UNECE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON "RISK ASSESSMENT AND MANAGEMENT"

12. The secretary of the Committee on Trade informed delegations of the debate in the UNECE Executive Committee about the redirection of the Committee. He emphasized the

continued support of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and its member States for the activities of the Working Party.

V. STANDARDIZATION AND REGULATORY PRACTICE

A. Review of developments

1. Standardization

13. The representative of the European Commission reported on the ongoing European Union review of its standardization policy (see: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/european-standards/standardisation-policy/policy-review/express/index_en.htm). The review aims at assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the current system. An expert panel, EXPRESS, had been set up to develop strategic recommendations and alternative options for reform. The panel would deliver its final report by January 2010. The Commission, Member States, standardisation bodies and stakeholders would then be encouraged to take up the Panel's recommendations.

14. The representative of CEN/CENELEC outlined the actions taken by the three European standardization organizations, European Committee for Standardization (CEN), CENELEC and European Telecommunications Standards Institute (ETSI), to respond to the challenges identified by the EU and by the European Free Trade Association, in particular:

(a) The creation of the CEN/CENELEC Management Centre would ensure optimal coordination and allocation of resources between the two organizations;

(b) A project was under way to enhance the access to standardization processes and to standards by small and medium enterprises;

(c) CEN and CENELEC were providing funding for quality infrastructure in developing countries and were promoting the visibility and use of European standards internationally, including through dedicated web portals.

2. Customs Union among the Russian Federation, Belarus and Kazakhstan

15. The representative of Belarus presented the technical regulation system of the Euro-Asian Economic Community and of the Customs Union among the Russian Federation, Belarus and Kazakhstan. The Customs Union, which was to enter into force on 1 January 2010, aimed at developing and implementing: (a) a single set of mandatory requirements for products and (b) a common system for assessment of the conformity of products to these requirements. Once the system was in place, products assessed in the country of origin would be entitled to move freely in the territory of the Customs Union, with no further checks at the border. The mandatory requirements would be modelled with reference to those contained in the most important EU directives and international standards. The parties to the Customs Union, in July 2009, had drawn up a package of transitional measures that would provide for mutual recognition of test results and product certificates. An information system was also being set up to facilitate information exchange on regulatory and phyto, and phyto-sanitary measures among the members. Further references can be found at: www.tsouz.ru and www.evrazes.com (in Russian).

3. EU REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemicals) Regulation

16. The representative of the European Commission provided an update on the implementation of the EU REACH Regulation. The secretariat of the Eurasian Interstate Council for Standardization, Metrology and Certification (EASC) referred to a communication sent in writing to the Commission concerning difficulties encountered by companies from countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) with the registration procedures. The Commission representative would follow up to the EASC communication after the session.

17. The representative of the Russian Federation reported that exporters from the Russian Federation had encountered difficulties with compliance, in particular as regards: (a) participating in forums on the quality of chemical substances; (b) choosing reliable Single Representatives; (c) managing related contractual arrangements and (d) seeking and receiving guidance from different authorities in different EU member States.

18. The Russian Federation proposed an exchange of experience among non-EU countries so as to learn from best practice in implementing REACH, and sharing information about the national authorities in charge of different aspects of REACH implementation

19. The representative of the European Commission objected that other channels of communication existed and could be exploited to convey the difficulties encountered by exporters. On the other hand, the representative of Belarus and the EASC secretariat supported the proposal.

20. The Working Party noted the proposals from the delegation of the Russian Federation to improve exchange of information concerning the experience in the implementation of REACH among non-EU member States. It was decided that the Russian Federation would nominate a Rapporteur to coordinate this work.

21. Belarus briefly reported on a recent conference for CIS countries held in Minsk, on the "Regulation of chemicals safety: UN Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) Recommendations and European Regulations", as an example of joint work by the CIS countries in this area.

4. Quarterly reports

22. The Working Party approved the proposal by the delegation of the Czech Republic that quarterly reports and a yearly consolidated report should be drafted on preparation and completion of technical regulations in the European Union. This was complemented by a proposal by CIS countries to do the same for their region.

23. The Working Party requested the secretariat to compile the information it would receive from different partners in an appropriate format and post it on the WP.6 website. The Working Party nominated Mr. M. Chloupek, of the Czech Office for Standards, Metrology and Testing, as a Rapporteur for developments in EU countries. Belarus would contact the secretariat after the session to confirm the name of the Rapporteur for the CIS countries. Mr. Mamba, of the

Swaziland Standards Authority, agreed after the session to act as coordinator for African countries.

B. Development and update of recommendations on regulatory cooperation and standardization policies

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/378 – UNECE Recommendations on Standardization Policies
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2008/6/Rev.1 - Final version of Recommendation "K"
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/8 - Proposal for revision of Recommendation "D"

24. In its further work revising Recommendation "D", the Working Party decided to take into account the proposal by Belarus for the amendment it proposed on "Reference to Standards" (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/8).

25. The Working Party noted the final version of Recommendation "K" on, "Assurance of Conformity Assessment and Testing" (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2008/6/Rev.1), which it had adopted at its eighteenth session, as contained in the package of updated recommendations (ECE/TRADE/378).

26. A representative of the private-sector company Nestlé presented a case study to illustrate how counterfeiting could potentially impact on product safety and why, for this reason, increased implementation of Recommendation "M" was highly desirable.

VI. REGULATORY COOPERATION

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/378 - UNECE Recommendations on Standardization Policies
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/17 - Report of the Meeting of WP.6 Bureau, Rapporteurs and Coordinators, "START" team and "MARS" group, Stockholm (27-29 May 2009)

27. The Working Party noted the report of activities of its ad hoc Team of Specialists on Standardization and Regulatory Techniques ("START" Team) and its Advisory Group on Market Surveillance ("MARS" Group), who had met in Stockholm in May 2009 (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/17).

A. Regional projects

28. The Working Party invited regional organizations to provide updated information on their regulatory cooperation activities and projects. It requested the secretariat to include these reports in the documentation for the next plenary session.

B. Sectoral projects

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/4 - Progress report on the Sectoral Initiative on Telecom
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/5 - Progress report on the Sectoral Initiative on Earth-Moving Machinery
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/6 - Progress report on the Sectoral Initiative on Explosive Environments Equipment
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/7 - Progress report on the Sectoral Initiative on Pipeline Safety

29. The Working Party presented the progress report on the Sectoral Initiative on Telecom and discussed the continued relevance of Recommendation "L". It was observed that countries could use the UNECE model and the Common Regulatory Objectives (CROs) that had already been developed in different sectors, not only with the aim of entering into binding agreements but also as the basis for good legislation and good regulatory practices.

30. Recommendation "L" could be usefully extended to explicitly refer to current work items in the Working Party's programme, specifically those relating to market surveillance.

1. Telecom Initiative

31. The Convenor of the Telecom Initiative Mr. P. Döfnäs (Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson, Sweden) noted the limited interest from member countries in applying the CROs adopted in 2003. For this reason, the Initiative would appreciate the assistance of the secretariat in initiating a discussion about the CROs with the main producers and Governments in East Asia.

32. In the ongoing negotiations in the World Trade Organization (WTO) on Market Access for Non-Agricultural Products (NAMA), two proposals had been put forward by the EU and the United States for overcoming Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs) to trade in electronics. These included products within the scope of the "Telecom Initiative". The proposals were closely aligned with the CROs developed by UNECE. The Convenor presented a concrete example of two electronic products and highlighted the complementary aspects of the International Model and the WTO negotiating proposal TN/MA/W/119 (the example is available on the WP.6 website). WTO member States could therefore examine ways in which the UNECE Telecom Initiative could be made more visible in the work in WTO.

33. The Working Party took note of the progress made by the Task Force (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/4). It also invited the secretariat, the Rapporteur and the Task Force to continue to promote the CROs and encouraged countries to further implement them.

2. Earth-Moving Machinery Initiative

34. The Convenor of the Task Force on Earth-Moving Machinery, Mr. D. Roley (ISO TC-127 Chairman), presented the Initiative, which aims at minimizing the risks during the lifetime of the machine and at facilitating international trade. The Task Force supporting the

Earthmoving Initiative had widely promoted the CROs in China, Russia, Chile, India and the Republic of Korea. The CROs were broadly acceptable and general enough to fit into regulatory models in place in different countries.

35. However, it was decided in 2008 that the CROs needed to be revised. The proposed revision addressed those developing countries where trust in manufacturers was not sufficiently established for a system based on Supplier Declaration of Conformity (SDoC). For such countries, the proposed revised CROs provided for the manufacturer to work with a third party for assessment of conformity. The third-party process would take into account the results of testing done by the manufacturer, so as to avoid unnecessary costs and duplication of effort.

36. The Working Party took note of the progress made by the Sectoral Initiative, adopted the revised CROs as proposed, as well as the terms of reference of the Initiative (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/5). It also invited the secretariat, the Rapporteur and the Task Force to continue to promote the CROs and encouraged countries to further implement them.

3. Equipment for Explosive Atmosphere

37. The Convenor of the Sectoral Equipment for explosive atmosphere, Mr. F. Lienesch, (Physikalisch-Technische Bundesanstalt) presented a proposal for CROs in that sector. A first draft of the proposed CROs had been presented to the meeting of the WP.6 Bureau in Stockholm and a revised draft had been endorsed at a meeting organized by the Sectoral Initiative in Melbourne, back to back with the annual meetings of the International Electrotechnical Commission system for the certification to standards for electrical equipment for explosive atmospheres (IECEx Scheme). This also allowed the initiative to benefit from the presence of many technical experts and other stakeholders.

38. The scope of the proposed CROs was broad and specified electrical and mechanical requirements for equipment to be placed on the market with a complete lifecycle approach. The CROs provided for the safe installation of the equipment and its use in the workplace, as well as related inspections, maintenance and repair. The CROs had been developed with reference to international standards and conformity assessment procedures developed by IEC and ISO. Internationally recognized certification schemes, such as IECEx, were an acceptable system for proving compliance to the proposed CROs.

39. The Convenor proposed that the Working Party at its next session should consider establishing a Standard Acceptance Group that would be composed by experts of countries that had formally joined the initiative. The Group would be tasked to review standards and consider their relevance for the initiative.

40. One delegation expressed concern at the additional cost to the industry of implementing the IECEx scheme, a requirement that was not contained in the European Union legislation, in particular the ATEX directive (Appareils destinés à être utilisés en ATmosphères EXplosibles). The delegation of Germany and the secretariat of IEC provided reassurance that the scheme was not unduly costly and was closely aligned with the EU regulations.

41. The Working Party took note of the progress made by the Sectoral Initiative and adopted the proposed CROs (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/6). It also invited the secretariat, the Rapporteur and the Task Force to promote the CROs and encouraged countries to implement them. The Working Party would be informed of the date of the next meeting of the Sectoral Initiative, which would take place in August 2010, in Berlin, back to back with the annual meetings of the IECEx system.

4. Safety of Pipelines

42. The representative of the Russian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs presented the Sectoral Initiative on Pipeline Safety. She explained how the initiative took as its starting point the "Safety guidelines and good practices for pipelines", approved in 2005 under the UNECE Conventions on the "Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents" and the "Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes" (see: <http://www.unece.org/env/teia/water/pipeline/pipeline%20safety.htm>.

43. The initiative under WP.6 had a much broader scope: it aimed at defining a set of safety requirements flanked by standards to be used to provide a presumption of conformity with these requirements. Requirements would need to be specified with reference to different geographical, climatic and morphologic conditions to provide optimal protection from risk without excessive costs. An initial proposal along these lines would be sent to the secretariat by April 2010.

44. The representative expressed her wish for increased cooperation between the Pipelines Safety initiative and the ISO Technical Committee 67 on "Materials, equipment and offshore structures for petroleum, petrochemical and natural gas industries". This cooperation would be developed through contacts with the ISO member bodies.

45. The Working Party took note of the interest shown by delegations and of the progress made by the Sectoral Initiative.

46. The Working Party: (a) approved the terms of reference of the Initiative (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/7); (b) invited the Ministry of Energy of the Russian Federation to officially nominate a rapporteur for the Initiative; and (c) requested the secretariat to circulate initial proposals by the Coordinator, in particular to countries participating in the "North Stream" and "South Stream" projects, and to prepare a consolidated version of the proposal reflecting comments received for the next meeting of the WP.6 Bureau.

47. The Working Party requested the secretariat to continue providing annual updates on the work of all the sectoral initiatives.

VII. REVIEW OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT AND ACCREDITATION

48. The representative of ISO reported on recent developments under the Committee on Conformity Assessment (ISO/CASCO). Ongoing work in this area focused on the development and updating of a toolbox of standards and guides. One of the working groups was developing a guidance document that would combine and update existing ISO guides nos. 23, 28, 63 and 67 on product certification.

49. Topical subjects in the Committee included: (a) maintaining the good reputation of ISO management system standards certification; (b) identifying best practice in conformity assessment in successful sectors and seeing if those examples could be generalized; and (c) promoting energy efficiency and sustainability. ISO/CASCO also planned to develop an information document on good practice in market surveillance and to organize a workshop on risk assessment and management back to back with the next ISO/CASCO Plenary in November 2010. The cooperation of UNECE on these topics would be sought to avoid duplication of efforts.

50. The Working Party invited delegations as well as regional and international organizations to continue an exchange of information and experiences on conformity assessment and accreditation

VIII. MARKET SURVEILLANCE

A. Updates from regional groupings and the Advisory Group on Market Surveillance ("MARS" Group)

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/9 - Report of the Advisory Group on Market Surveillance, its activities and its meeting
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/10 – Information from the CIS on market surveillance

51. The Working Party adopted the report of the meeting of the MARS Group, which was held in Bratislava from 8 to 10 October 2009 (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/9), and presented by the Chairperson of the MARS Group.

52 The Working Party asked the delegations to provide the secretariat with contact information of market surveillance authorities so that the secretariat can compile a compendium and post it on the website. The Working Party encouraged the Group to continue to promote the implementation of Recommendation "M".

53. The Coordinator for Liaison with Market Surveillance Bodies of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS Liaison Coordinator) presented recent activities of the CIS Working Group on Market Surveillance. The Group held regular meetings to promote cooperation and exchange of information among market surveillance authorities. The next meeting would take place in Astana in May 2010. The Group set common priorities for market surveillance activities, and coordinated actions relating to dangerous and non-conforming products found on national markets.

54. The Working Party noted the report on market surveillance activities under the auspices of the Commonwealth of Independent States (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/10). It requested the secretariat to continue to make reports on market surveillance activities received from Member States available as part of the documentation for the annual session.

55. The representative of the European Commission recalled the main elements of the New Legislative Framework (NLF), as laid out in two complementary instruments (regulation

765/2008/EC and decision 768/2008/EC available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newapproach/index_en.htm>. The European Commission had prepared detailed information guidelines to assist Member States in fulfilling their immediate obligations under the NLF.

56. Additionally, the Commission would work to: (a) align existing *acquis* to the NLF; (b) increase cooperation and sharing of information among national market surveillance authorities. Planned actions included: (a) collecting and sharing information about respective responsibilities and contact details of sectoral/regional market surveillance authorities; (b) enhancing and reorganizing the Rapid Information Exchange (RAPEX) system; (c) extending the Internet-based Information and Communication System for Market Surveillance (ICSMS).

57. The CIS Liaison Coordinator referred to Article 26 of Regulation 765/2008/EC, which provided for cooperation with the competent authorities of third countries. She asked how the European Commission would implement this provision. The European Commission replied that implementing provisions had not yet been developed.

B. Update on the Market Surveillance Model Initiative

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/11 – Market surveillance: general concept and how it relates to the activities of the Working Party
Draft guide to the use of the General Market Surveillance Model - (not officially issued, but available in English and Russian at
http://www.unece.org/trade/wp6/documents/2009/wp6_09_GMS_012E.pdf
http://www.unece.org/trade/wp6/documents/2009/wp6_09_GMS_012R.pdf)

58. The secretariat introduced ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/11, and explained how market surveillance was a key issue not only in the work of the "MARS" group, but also in that of the sectoral initiatives active under the "START" Team.

59. The Convenor of the General Market Surveillance Model Initiative explained that the document was not intended as a detailed handbook but to provide market surveillance authorities with general guidelines for action in relation to non-food products.

60. The Model covered all the successive phases of market surveillance actions: the preparatory phase the execution phase and the conclusive phase. These phases included: (a) defining applicable technical legislation, standards, essential requirements, conformity assessment criteria, and developing a sampling and test plan; (b) carrying out all administrative tasks, inspection and testing, in-situ sampling and enforcement actions; (c) contacting relevant stakeholders, updating national or regional databases, giving feedback to technical legislation authorities and contacting media and customs authorities.

61. The flowcharts in the document provided a visual overview of the three phases, and the contribution of different stakeholders to each of them.

62. Issues needing to be developed further included: (a) the role of standards and technical regulations, (b) the use of statistical techniques, (c) the development of sub-procedures, practical case studies, and (d) the extension of the model to different sectors. More active involvement of experts, authorities and academia was desirable in further developing the document.

63. The representative of the International Federation of Standards Users (IFAN) said that the document should not provide too much detailed information, because this would become irrelevant with further technical developments. A representative of Belarus proposed that statistical methods developed for ensuring quality and stability of production could be adapted to the model. These ideas would be considered in further developing the document. The CIS Liaison Coordinator informed delegations that the CIS Working Group on Market Surveillance would continue its discussion of the General Model at its forthcoming meetings.

64. The Working Party noted the new version of the draft guide to the use of the General Model and decided to endorse it as a training document while continuing to improve and promote it. The Working Party also asked the secretariat to coordinate with the EASC secretariat to improve the Russian translation of the document.

C. Common definitions and terminology in market surveillance

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/13 - Draft common definitions and terminology in market surveillance (corrigendum)

65. The Convenor of the Initiative on Common Definitions and Terminology in Market Surveillance presented document ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/13. He explained that the document would be the only comprehensive glossary of market surveillance terms available internationally. It would be particularly useful, because in that area of work, terminology, and notably the term “market surveillance”, had different meanings in different countries and under different regulatory frameworks.

66. A representative of Belarus commented that the document should be structured into different parts related to different areas of work. This suggestion would be taken into account at a later stage, when the document was being finalized for publication.

67. The Working Party agreed that the document should be developed for information, and not for adoption as a UNECE Recommendation.

68. The Working Party encouraged delegations to send the secretariat any definitions contained in their national regulations, which differed from those included in the current document, preferably by the end of March 2010. It requested the secretariat to incorporate contributions from member States and regional organizations, and to circulate a second draft of the document for the meeting of the Bureau and “START” Team scheduled for early June 2010.

IX. METROLOGY

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2008/6/Rev.1 - Final version of Recommendation "K"

69. The representative of OIML provided an update on activities of that Organization during the past year. OIML worked actively with regional legal metrology organizations to assist in avoiding a multiplicity of requirements in that field and promoting regulatory cooperation.

70. The OIML Mutual Acceptance Arrangement[2] was among certification bodies performing type approval on measuring instruments. It stipulated that the members would approve each other's test results in type-approval procedures. This was done per category of measuring instruments and for each category there is a declaration of mutual confidence. The basic work of OIML is performed by its Technical Committees, which are formed when countries decide to harmonize their technical regulations. Increased cooperation with UNECE, to see how Recommendation "L" could be used in this context, would be explored.

71. Cooperation was ongoing between OIML and WELMEC, the European Cooperation in Legal Metrology, which developed guidance for the implementation of EU directives. OIML Recommendations could be used to give presumption of conformity with EU directives in this field.

72. WELMEC was currently developing risk assessment tools for market surveillance and enforcement, and measuring instruments, while OIML was considering developing a risk assessment model for use in the various phases of metrological control, which would include the drafting of standards.

X. PROGRAMME OF WORK AND PRIORITIES OF THE WORKING PARTY

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/2009/12 - Report of the third session of the Committee on Trade
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/15 - Revised table of priorities
ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/16 - Evaluation of the Working Party

73. The Working Party approved the proposed changes to the table of priorities (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/15), including the suggestions of Belarus, Georgia, Mozambique and Russian Federation. It requested the secretariat and the Bureau to prepare the programme of work for 2010-2012, taking into account the outcome of the International Conference and the annual session, and to present it to the Working Party at the next annual session.

74. The Working Party noted the results of the self-evaluation exercise conducted at the previous session (ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/16). It observed that the number of evaluation forms received were insufficient for a satisfactory evaluation and encouraged delegations to invest more time in the evaluation of the session from now on.

---

[2] http://maa.oiml.org/

XI. CAPACITY-BUILDING

Documentation: ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/18 - Aid for trade: Supporting the use of standards

75. The secretariat introduced document ECE/TRADE/C/WP.6/2009/18. The report argued for increased resources to be allocated to standardization and regulatory cooperation within the WTO initiative on "Aid for Trade". This would allow developing countries and countries with economies in transition to participate as full players in standards development and implementation.

76. The representative of UNITAR presented the Institute's experience in e-Learning on trade-related policies. UNITAR organized online training courses for professionals from developing countries and economies in transition as its full-time work. Courses had been attended by more than 800 professionals in the last two years, from diverse organizations (private companies, government administrations, central banks). Course completion rates had averaged 87 per cent and participants had also benefited from online networking with other participants.

77. The Vice-President of the European Academy of Standardization (EURAS) presented the non-for profit organization. It provided a forum for discussion primarily among academicians, and aimed at promoting research, education and regional/international cooperation in standardization.

78. There were several ways that UNECE and EURAS could cooperate. These included: (a) WP.6 members could subscribe to the EURAS mailing list; (b) WP.6 could request EURAS assistance in finding speakers for Conferences and events; (c) WP.6 and EURAS could organize joint sessions/workshops; (d) EURAS could start new working groups on topics such as regulatory cooperation, to which WP.6 experts could participate. Finally, a new book series: "Contributions to Standardisation Research" had been started. Manuscripts for publications were solicited from the WP.6 delegates.

79. EURAS 2010 event would be held on 1 and 2 July in Lausanne, Switzerland, back to back with the "World Standards Cooperation (WSC) Academic Week" organized by ISO, IEC and the International Telecommunication Union.

80. The representative of Mozambique requested the assistance of UNECE on issues related to regulatory cooperation, standardization and conformity assessment. African countries had weak quality infrastructure, which severely hampered their integration in international trade networks. There was also a need to sensitize trade and industry ministries about the importance of these issues, through capacity-building events and seminars.

81. The Convenor of the Initiative on Common Definitions and Terminology in Market Surveillance presented a project being developed with several external partners. The project aimed at developing a new, advanced market surveillance model. The model would be based on an analysis of essential requirements in non-food technical regulations, and related product standards. It would be supported by methods for assessing risk and measuring uncertainty, and by existing and new sampling and statistical methodologies. He would welcome the cooperation of WP.6, in particular in defining the needs of market surveillance authorities, and in

disseminating the results of the project. The CIS Liaison Coordinator, however, believed that research should not be a priority for the "MARS" Group, which should instead focus on issues of immediate concern to the members.

82. Raising funds for the development of the WP. 6 various areas of work was proving very difficult. Twinning between EU Member States and neighbouring countries could be explored as one possibility for building capacity in this area.

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

83. The Working Party thanked the secretariat for its outreach activities, in particular the publication "A Common Regulatory Language for Trade and Development" (ECE/TRADE/375), the brochure, and the revamping of the WP.6 website.

84. The Working Party decided to amend the organizational chart to better match the programme of work and asked the secretariat to issue a new version before the next annual session.

86. The Working Party will hold its twentieth session from 1 to 3 November 2010.

XIII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

87. According to established procedure, the Working Party approved a list of decisions taken at the current session. The secretariat was requested, in consultation with the office bearers, to complete the descriptive part of the report taking into account the contributions made and the discussions held during the session.

* * * *