Advanced Passenger Research Recommendations Summary

Recommendation 1: Batch API is recommended for any initial implementation in the Pacific.

Recommendation 2: Consideration should only be given to the implementation of iAPI once the human, systems, and legislative capability within agencies and Governments has adapted and expanded to effectively accommodate Batch API.

Recommendation 3: The adoption of PNR should only be considered once the human, systems and legislative capability within agencies has adapted and expanded following API implementation.

Recommendation 4: PIDC members should note that, while ETA or pre-clearance measures, PNR and Interpol SLTD interoperability are not mandatory, they are recommended by ICAO and/or the UNSC.

Recommendation 5: Consistent with the principles of CBM and UNSCRs, consideration should be given to improving PIDC members' border management through:

- the direct acquisition of API systems capability by PIDC members; or

- the central negotiation and procurement of API systems capability by an organisation such as PIDC, on behalf of all interested members.

Recommendation 6: Members should consider the adoption of the standard set of API data fields used for transmission from carriers to border control agencies, as defined by ICAO, WCO and IATA, as prescribed in the *Draft Regulations* at **Annex 2, Schedule 1** of this report.

Recommendation 7: It is highly recommended that some form of API integration be adopted by those PIDC members which have a BMS.

Recommendation 8: Border control agencies that receive data should ensure relevant systems and hardware are up-to-date, and secured behind appropriate physical and software safeguards and controls.

Recommendation 9: It is highly recommended that renewed emphasis be placed on the review and modernisation of PIDC members' Immigration legislation order to create an environment conducive to the introduction of API and information sharing more broadly, consistent with the principles of CBM.

Recommendation 10: CBS suggests that the CARICOM JRCC may be a viable model upon which to base a collaborative Pacific regional API collaborative arrangement.
The CARICOM JRCC is considered a viable model upon which to base a possible collaborative Pacific regional API arrangement.

Recommendation 11: PIDC should consider the implications of SITA's model which highlight the potential for cost-effective "regional" service offerings to Governments facing significant resourcing and capability constraints.

Recommendation 12: It is recommended that, while it is open to PIDC members to implement API connectivity and assessment on an individual basis, the potential benefit of economies of scale will not be realised meaning that the complexity and costs are likely to be greater because at least some checking and assessment of API within each PIDC member country will be required.

Recommendation 13: Consideration should be given to a regional approach to API which would allow smaller PIDC member states which either do not have a BMS, or do not have a BMS which is API capable, to still derive benefit from API data.

Recommendation 14: PIDC members should note that adoption of a regional approach to API would not diminish or absolve PIDC members from their ability and responsibility to also carry out their own assessments against national BMS and other databases, or impinge upon the ultimate sovereignty of members and their data.

Recommendation 15: CBS strongly recommends that consideration be given to the establishment of a Regional Traveller Assessment Centre in keeping with the Boe Declaration and Action Plan.

Recommendation 16: CBS recommends that, unlike CARICOM IMPACS, a model to provide ongoing funding for a Regional Traveller Assessment Centre, independent of Government budget allocations or donors, be sought from the outset.

Recommendation 17: PIDC members should note the possible funding options for the development and introduction of a regional API arrangement, particularly the option of using donor funding to establish a regional data assessment and information sharing centre with ongoing operational and development costs funded through the imposition of a modest levy per ticket (Option 4).

Recommendation 18: PIDC members should review the draft definitions and additional provisions proposed for inclusion in their Immigration Act as outlined in Annex 2 and adopt as necessary.

Recommendation 19: PIDC members should consider the inclusion of some or all of the definitions and draft provisions to support the introduction of API proposed for inclusion in their Immigration Regulations, as outlined in Annex 2.