



New Zealand and Australia

- Different sized economies
- Different structures
- Common regulatory environment in many sectors
- Broad recognition of accreditation

FIRST MRA



- **NATA and IANZ signed a formal Mutual Recognition Arrangement in 1981**
- **Pre-dates CER**
- **The core of this Arrangement is the basis of today's APLAC and ILAC Arrangements**

True Recognition



- **Interaction at Board Level**
- **Interaction at technical level**
 - Programme Managers; technical committees
- **Common use of Technical Experts**



Standards, Technical Regulations and Conformity Assessment

- **Good Consumer Law**
 - Light, risk based, utilising standards and CAP
- **Harmonisation of Regulation**
 - Electrical; Electronic regulations similar or identical
- **Equivalence of Standards**
 - Electrical products (IEC Standards) and EMC (CISPR Standards); Joint AS/NZS standards
- **Harmonisation of Conformity Assessment**
- **NATA/IANZ/JAS-ANZ**



Supporting Good Regulatory Practice

- Regulations are transparent
- Products sold in one jurisdiction can automatically be sold in the other jurisdiction
- Includes regulated products
 - dairy; meat; shellfish
- And alternatives to regulation
 - wool; steel; aluminium

WTO Requirements



- Both Australia and New Zealand meet WTO requirements
- Regulations are transparent
- Regulations are scientifically or technically justifiable
- Regulations are non-discriminatory

Regulatory dialogue critical,



- Economies are different
- Product low risk in one economy and high risk in another economy
- Presence of pests and diseases; level of sophistication of manufacturing; capability level of the technical infrastructure

Most cost effective



- **Technical regulations based on conformity assessment are the more cost effective**
- **Avoid duplication**
- **Reduced direct regulator involvement (saving taxpayer dollars)**

What do Regulators Want



- Rigorous, robust process
- Confidence in the outcome
- Minimum risk of failure of product or service
- No risk to public health or safety
- Minimise liability to regulator



How we ensure competence

- Accreditation Standard (17011)
- Laboratory Standard (17025)
- Inspection Body Standard (17020)
- Certification Bodies
(management systems; personnel
and product)

A/NZ Situation



- **Many regulators require accredited CABs** (laboratories, inspection bodies or certification bodies)
- **A/NZ regulators use accredited conformity assessment more than any other economies. (Also EU)**
- **Gives them confidence in the process**
- **Ensures contestable delivery**



Competent Laboratories

- **Asbestos testing**
- **Drinking water testing**
- **Dairy testing**
- **Food testing**
- **Medical testing**
- **Fuel testing**
- **High risk electrical and electronic products**

Competent Inspection Bodies



- Cranes; boilers; machinery
- NDT/Welding
- Food Safety (HACCP) programmes
- Building consenting and inspection

Accreditation can help



- Confidence in test and inspection reports
- Reduction of risk for regulators and consumers
- Reduced liability for regulators
- Not just for trade
- Significant quality improvement for all clients

Regulatory Approval



- In most cases, regulators still approve
- Accreditation is used as cost effective technical assurance
- Everyone has confidence in the regulations; confidence in the process; and confidence in the outcome