



**Asia-Pacific  
Economic Cooperation**

---

**2015/CTI/WKSP2/002**

## **Project Completion Report**

Submitted by: Korea



**APEC**  
PHILIPPINES  
2 0 1 5

**Capacity Building Workshop Dealing with a  
New Trade Landscape: Complexities of Rules  
of Origin and Logistical Challenges of Trade  
Facilitation**

**Seoul, Korea**

**22-24 September 2015**

# Project Completion Report

Please submit through your APEC Secretariat Program Director within 2 months of project completion. Reports should be 3-4 pages. Please append participants list.

## SECTION A: Project profile

<b>Project number &amp; title:</b>	APEC FTAAP Capacity Building Workshop ( <b>Self-funded Project</b> )		
<b>Project time period:</b>	February - December 2015	<b>Date submitted:</b>	13 January 2016
<b>Committee / WG / Fora:</b>	Committee on Trade and Investment		
<b>Project Overseer Name / Organization / Economy:</b>	Sung-Yo CHOI / International Economic Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs / Republic of Korea.		

## SECTION B: Project report and reflection

### 1. **Project description:** In 3-4 sentences, please describe the project and its main objectives.

The APEC FTAAP Capacity Building Workshop (“Dealing with a New Trade Landscape: Complexities of Rules of Origin and Logistical challenges of Trade Facilitation”) was held in Seoul, from 22 to 24, September 2015.

The objective of the workshop was to address various issues of Rules of Origin (hereinafter “ROO”) in the FTAs and enhance understandings on the key contents of the newly adopted WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement (TFA) as well as its implications for FTAs.

The program consisted of presentations for two days (22-23 September) by experts and trade negotiators from international organizations, academia, and governments of member economies as well as on-site visit to the Incheon Main Customs of the Republic of Korea (24 September).

### 2. **Meeting objectives:** Describe how the project met each of its proposed objectives. Please outline any challenges you may have encountered in delivering the activity.

All of the project objectives have been met, thanks to the active engagement of APEC member economies. Of the 21 APEC members, 16 economies participated in the workshop.

A post-seminar survey showed that participants viewed it as a success. Among the contributing factors they identified were the speakers’ qualifications, the good mix of speakers, and nice logistical arrangements.

### 3. **Evaluation:** Describe the process undertaken to evaluate the project upon completion. (e.g. evaluation through participant surveys, peer reviews of outputs, assessments against indicators, statistics demonstrating use of outputs etc.). Provide analysis of results of evaluations conducted and where possible include information on impacts on gender. *Evaluation data needs to be included as an appendix.*

Pursuant to the APEC guidelines, an evaluation sheet was included in the seminar document package prepared by the host economy so that participants could assess the seminar and suggest improvements for future seminars, if necessary.

The organizers collected the survey questionnaires from the participants after the seminar. There were five potential ratings for each category: “satisfactory”, “good”, “fair”, “not satisfactory”, and “bad” (with “satisfactory” being the highest rating and “bad” the lowest).

Regarding the overall assessment of the seminar, 18 respondents (64.3%) answered “satisfactory” and 10 (35.7%) responded with “good.” This means that all participants surveyed found the seminar either satisfactory or good. Most of the respondents found that topics were suitable, useful, and interesting; speakers were excellent and knowledgeable; overall organization was dynamic; and the hosts were friendly.

Regarding the assessment on the fulfillment of the objective, extent of meeting the objectives of the Workshop, 18 respondents (64.3%) assessed that the overall seminar was "satisfactory", 10 respondents (35.7%) chose "good". Most of the participants said that the program was informative, comprehensive, balanced between its practicality and academic issues.

Regarding benefits of the workshop to individual participants, many of the respondents mentioned that the workshop provided them with a good opportunity to deepen their understanding on the key contents of the ROO and TFA.

Regarding the possible improvements that could be made on the future Workshops/Seminars under the CBNi programs, following comments were received:

- The speakers were excellent but future activities could involve more trade negotiators and stakeholders from business with real experiences.
- Regarding the format, more interaction, more discussion and/or group activities could be introduced.
- There need to be more exercises to better understand the topic.
- Presentation materials need to be circulated well in advance to participants.
- More time and opportunities need to be focused on sharing participant's experiences and comments.

In conclusion, feedback and comments were generally positive and constructive. The organizers are confident that the "2015 APEC FTAAP Capacity Building Workshop: Dealing with a New Trade Landscape-Complexities of Rules of Origin and Logistical challenges of Trade Facilitation" achieved its intended objectives.

**4. Output indicators: Describe the main project outputs below. This may include workshops, tools, research papers, reports, recommendations, best practices, action plans.**

<b>Indicators</b> <i>(Edit or Insert rows as needed)</i>	<b># planned</b>	<b># actual</b>	<b>Details or notes</b>
# workshops / events	2	2	1 Seminar and 1 on-site visit were implemented.
# participants (M/F)	42(21/21)	31(12/19)	Male 12, Female 19
# economies attending	21	16	Vietnam, China, Malaysia, Russia, Peru, Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Mexico, Brunei, Singapore, Japan, Korea, Hong Kong , USA, Chinese Taipei
# speakers (including discussants) engaged	18	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mr. Stefano Inama, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD),</li> <li>- Mr. Henry Gao, Singapore Management University,</li> <li>- Pf. Yuka Fukunaga, Waseda University,</li> <li>- Ms.Margaret Liang, Singaporean Foreign Ministry,</li> <li>- Ms.Mette Werdelin Azzam, World Customs Organization (WCO)</li> <li>- Mr.Heng Wang, University of New South Wales</li> <li>- Mr.Jawyang Huang, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Chinese Taipei</li> <li>- Dr. Hyo-Young Lee, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP)</li> <li>- Pf. Dukgeun Ahn, Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University</li> <li>- Pf. Deok-Young Park, School of Law, Yonsei University</li> <li>- Mr. Kichang Chung, Yoon &amp; Yang, Seoul</li> </ul>

			Korea - Pf. Asif Qureshi, School of Law, Korea University - Ms. Eleanor Thornton, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) - Ms. Joohyoung Lee, Kim & Chang, Seoul Korea - Pf. Jaemin Lee, School of Law, Seoul National University - Mr. Gab-Young Shim, Korea Customs Service - Ms. Eun-Suk Ahn, Korea Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KCCI) - Mr. Chul-Hun Lee, WCO Regional Intelligence Liaison Office for Asia and the Pacific
# other organizations engaged	0	0	
# publications distributed	0	0	Seminar document package for participants
# recommendations agreed on	0	0	N/A
Other:			

**5. Outcomes:** Describe any specific medium-term changes to policy, processes or behaviour that can be attributed to result from this activity. Please include details on:

- What indicators were used to measure medium-term impact? (Example indicators: type/number of policies/ regulations/processes changed, % of businesses conforming to new standards, change in sector's commercial activity, # individual action plans developed, # agencies using resource or tools etc.)
- Monitoring plans in place and proposed indicators to measure impacts, including any impacts on gender. Please summarise relevant information.

Given that this project aims at enhancing negotiating capacities of developing economies in the long term, it is not easy to capture any short-term or medium-term impact of the project at this juncture. However, in the long-term, we believe that such efforts to narrow the widening gaps in the negotiating capabilities between the developed economies and developing economies will bear fruit and contribute to realizing the FTAAP.

**6. Participants:** This section contains a summary of participants and must be gender-disaggregated. (Note that a full participant contact list is a mandatory requirement for all project events. The full participant list must contain contact info, gender, and job titles. It may be included as an appendix or inserted below).

Economy (Insert rows as needed)	# male	# female
Vietnam	1	1
China	2	
Malaysia	1	1
Russia		1
Peru	1	1
Philippines		2
Indonesia	2	
Thailand		2
Mexico		2
Brunei	1	

Singapore	1	1
Japan	1	
Korea		2
Hong Kong, China	1	2
USA		1
Chinese Taipei	1	3

**Comments: What was the approach undertaken for participant nomination/selection and targeting? Please provide details. What follow-up actions are expected? How will participants/beneficiaries continue to be engaged and supported to progress this work?**

Project overseers from past CBNI workshops, government officials in charge of the relevant negotiating subjects from member economies, officials in charge of capacity-building programs at other international organizations, and prominent scholars were invited to participate in the seminar as speakers and discussants.

For nomination of other participants, the host economy requested member economies to select FTA negotiators and trade policy makers.

**7. Key findings: Describe 1-3 examples of key findings, challenges or success stories arising from the project (e.g. research or case studies results, policy recommendations, roadblocks to progress on an issue, impacts on gender).**

In general, all participants in the workshop have expressed satisfaction with the contents and format of the workshop, however, some participants indicated possible room for improvement for the future activities, such as more focus on the interaction among participants during the workshop, more involvement of trade negotiators as speakers, and earlier circulation of the presentation materials.

**8. Next steps: Describe any planned follow-up steps or projects, such as workshops, post-activity evaluations, or research to assess the impact of this activity. How will the indicators from Question 5 be tracked? How will this activity inform any future APEC activities?**

The objective of the project is to strengthen the negotiating capacities of developing economies and contribute to the realization of the FTAAP, which is fully shared by many economies of APEC. Therefore, a series of workshops/seminars hosted by several economies will follow in 2016 to achieve this objective with the full support from APEC member economies.

For example, in January, Vietnam will host a workshop on Technical Barriers to Trade in Ho Chi Minh City. At the margin of SOM1, Peru will host workshop on “Existing IIAs in the APEC Region: Relevance, Emerging trends, Challenges and Policy options to address coherence in Treaty making” in Lima. Another workshop hosted by Peru will be at the margins of SOM 3 on the subject of services. Korea is also planning to organize a seminar/workshop on the field of services before SOM3 this year.

**9. Feedback for the Secretariat: Do you have suggestions for more effective support by APEC fora or the Secretariat? Any assessment of consultants, experts or other stakeholders to share? The Secretariat examines feedback trends to identify ways to improve our systems.**

Korea always appreciates valuable contributions of the Secretariat to make the project a success.

**SECTION C: Budget**

Attach a detailed breakdown of the APEC- provided project budget, including:

- Not Applicable as this project is wholly self-funded by the Korean government.