

Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Republic of Korea

FINAL REPORT

APEC FTAAP Capacity Building Workshop

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

Sept. 22-24, 2015

Seoul, Korea

Table of Contents

SUMMARY	3
PART I. The Program	5
1.1 Background.....	5
1.2 Objectives	5
1.3 Overview of the program.....	6
PART II. Outputs and Results	12
2.1 Participants	12
2.2 Summary of sessions	15
■ Session 1	15
■ Session 2.....	17
■ Session 3	19
■ Session 4.....	22
■ Session 5.....	24
■ Session 6.....	27
■ Session 7.....	29
PART III. Evaluation and Feedbacks	33
3.1. Survey Results	33

SUMMARY

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic Korea has successfully held "APEC FTAAP Capacity Building Program-Dealing with a New Trade Landscape: Complexities of Rules of Origin and Logistical Challenges of Trade Facilitation" (hereinafter, "seminar") on 22nd to 24th September, 2015 at Novotel Ambassador Gangnam Seoul Hotel, in Seoul Korea. The objective of the seminar was to address issues of Rules of Origin (hereinafter "ROO") in the era of FTAs and enhance their capacities in the trade negotiations and dispute settlements. In addition, ROOs unique rules on Trade Facilitation Agreements (hereinafter "TFA") in concluding mega-FTAs was discussed. Moreover, participants of the seminar reviewed the key contents of the Trade Facilitations Agreement of 2014 and its implications for FTAs and vice versa.

The program of the seminar was composed of 7 sessions for two full-days. On the first day, it covered an extensive range of ROO issues from basic overview sessions, such as understanding complexities and challenges of Rules of Origin in the FTA era (Session 1) and sharing the key provisions and characteristics of the Rules of Origin in WTO and FTAs (Session 2), moving on to understand the rules of origin in WTO/FTA dispute settlement mechanism (Session 3), and rules of origin in trans-pacific partnership as a new attempt in mega FTAs (Session 4), then, moving on to over-viewing trade facilitation agreement (Session 5), logistical challenges and capacity building for developing economies of APEC (Session 6) and wrapping up with discussions for future views of trade facilitation agreement and the future of the global trading regime (Session 7).

After the seminar, the participants assessed the program to be generally "satisfactory".

According to the post-seminar survey, the participants responded that the sessions, presenters, formats and organization were all satisfactory and they found the program informative, useful, and appropriate for the objective. They expected that the future activities in this field would include more discussions, interactions, and/or practitioners' contribution. Overall, the September CBNI program was yet another successful effort to assist APEC Economies in formulating policy choices in the newly surfacing trade matters of the new trade environment.

PART I. The Program

1.1 Background

One of the biggest challenges for the realization of the Free Trade Area of the Asia-Pacific (FTAAP) is the widening gap among the APEC member economies in terms of FTA capabilities. To fill this gap, 13 capacity-building programs were successfully implemented between 2012 and 2014 as part of the Capacity Building Needs Initiative (CBNI). In 2014, to maintain and utilize the momentum created in the first phase of the initiative, the APEC Leaders endorsed the Action Plan Framework for the second CBNI. In light of this, this workshop of September 2015 addressing two closely related trade issues - rules of origin (hereinafter “ROO”) and trade facilitation - will be conducive to the successful implementation of the second CBNI because the proposed topics are becoming increasingly important in FTA negotiations and today’s global trading environment.

1.2 Objectives

The objective of the workshop was to help participants better understand the key characteristics and the challenges of ROOs in the era of FTAs and enhance their capacities in the trade negotiations and dispute settlements. In addition, the participants had opportunities to share their views on legal and logistical issues that APEC member economies will face in concluding Mega-FTAs such as Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Moreover, the workshop helped participants to fully understand the key contents of the Trade Facilitation Agreement of 2014 and the new sets of obligations imposed on member economies as a result of the introduction of the new agreement. The participants also discussed the implication of Trade Facilitation Agreement for FTAs and vice versa.

The logistical challenges that the developing economies will encounter as a result of the TFA have been extensively discussed at the conference and, in turn, APEC’s capacity building efforts for trade facilitation have also been introduced. In many respects, the conference established a platform for further discussions among APEC Economies in implementing obligations under the Trade Facilitation Agreement.

1.3 Overview of the program

The seminar was held in Novotel Seoul Ambassador Gangnam from September 22nd to 24th. The two-day workshop included 7 sessions, starting with understanding complexities and challenges of Rules of Origin in the FTA era (Session 1) and sharing the key provisions and characteristics of the Rules of Origin in WTO and FTAs (Session 2), moving on to understand the rules of origin in WTO/FTA dispute settlement mechanism (Session 3), and rules of origin in trans-pacific partnership as a new attempt in mega FTAs (Session 4), then, moving on to overviewing trade facilitation agreement (Session 5), logistical challenges and capacity building for developing economies of APEC (Session 6) and wrapping up with discussions for future views of trade facilitation agreement and the future of the global trading regime (Session 7). The seminar was conducted in English and no interpretation was provided.

The sessions were generally composed of a presentation, a discussion followed by Q&A. The presentations and discussions were made by WTO experts from various parts of the APEC countries or international organizations, and from the public sector or academia. The list of presenters and discussants is provided as below, and their biographies are attached in appendices to this report:

- Mr. Stefano Inama, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
- Professor Henry Gao, Singapore Management University
- Professor Yuka Fukunaga, Waseda University
- Ms. Margaret Liang, Singaporean Foreign Ministry
- Ms. Mette Werdelin Azzam, World Customs Organization (WCO)
- Professor Heng Wang, University of New South Wales
- Mr. Jawyang Huang, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Chinese Taipei
- Dr. Hyo-Young Lee, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP)
- Professor Dukgeun Ahn, Graduate School of International Studies, Seoul National University

- Professor Deok-Young Park, School of Law, Yonsei University
- Mr. Kichang Chung, Yoon & Yang, Seoul Korea
- Professor Asif Qureshi, School of Law, Korea University
- Ms. Eleanor Thornton, United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
- Ms. Joohyoung Lee, Kim & Chang, Seoul Korea
- Professor 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

The overall program of “APEC FTAAP Capacity Building Workshop – dealing with a new trade landscape: Complexities of Rules of Origin and Logistical Challenges of Trade Facilitation” is provided in the following table:

DAY 1 (SEPT. 22) Tuesday	
8.30 am – 9.00 am	Arrival/Registration/Coffee
9:00 am – 9:05 am	Welcoming Remarks Ambassador Taeho Lee, Deputy Minister for Economic Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea
9.05 am – 9.10 am	Photo Session
9.10 am – 9.20 am	Introduction/Overview of Workshop Prof. Jaemin Lee, School of Law, Seoul National University
Session 1 9.20 am – 10.30 am	<p>Understanding Complexities and Challenges of Rules of Origin in the FTA Era</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Stefano Inama, Chief for the Division of Africa, Least Developed Countries and Special Programs, UNCTAD, Geneva, Switzerland <p><i>The first session will offer an introductory framework for the day 1 discussions, including the advent of increasing complexities involving Rules of Origin in the FTA era, and what this new phenomenon means, both legally and logistically, for the participating APEC Economies and their government agencies. The session will discuss a wide spectrum of structural changes and new challenges facing the APEC Economies in the FTA era in terms of Rules of Origin, with a particular emphasis on the situation of developing economies</i></p> <p>Designated Discussants: Prof. Henry Gao, Singapore Management University, Singapore; Prof. Yuka Fukunaga, Waseda University, Japan</p> <p>General Discussions (Questions & Answers Session with Participants)</p>
10.30 am – 10.45 am	Coffee Break
Session 2 10.45 am – 12.00 pm	<p>Key Provisions and Characteristics of the Rules of Origin in WTO and FTAs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Margaret Liang, Singaporean Foreign Ministry - Prof. Henry Gao, Singapore Management University. <p><i>The second session will then provide an overview of the key provisions of the Rules of Origin mechanism so as to inform the participants of how the mechanism would actually work in practice. The speakers and discussants will touch upon the key characteristics of the Rules of Origin both in the WTO and FTA regimes. They will also discuss what these rules actually mean for key domestic stakeholders such as corporations and business entities.</i></p> <p>Designated Discussants: Ms. Mette Werdelin Azzam, Technical Officer(Origin), WCO, Mr. Jaeho Jung, Deputy Director, FTA Implementation Division, Korea Customs Service, Ms. Eun-Suk Ahn, Manager, Trade Certificate Service Center, Korea Chamber of Commerce and Industry.</p> <p>General Discussions (Questions & Answers with Participants)</p>

12.00 pm – 1.30 pm	Luncheon
Session 3 1.30 pm – 3.10 pm	<p>Rules of Origin in WTO/FTA Dispute Settlement Mechanism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. Heng Wang, Visiting Professorial Fellow, the University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia - Ms. Mette Werdelin Azzam, Senior Technical Officer(Origin), WCO <p><i>The third session will address how the issue of Rules of Origin is addressed in the dispute settlement proceedings of the WTO and FTA. The discussions will also include unique traits that Rules of Origin disputes entail in the dispute settlement proceeding. The speakers and discussants will also explain expected disputes of Rules of Origin in the FTA era in the future.</i></p> <p>Designated Discussants: Dr. Hyo-Young Lee, Associate Research Fellow, Multilateral Trade Department of the Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP); Prof. Jaehyoung Lee, School of Law, Korea University</p> <p>General Discussions (Questions & Answers by the Participants)</p>
3.10 pm – 3.30 pm	Coffee Break
Session 4 3.30 pm – 5.00 pm	<p>Rules of Origin in Trans Pacific Partnership: A New Attempt in Mega-FTAs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. Yuka Fukunaga, Waseda University, Japan - Mr. Jawyang Huang, Office of Trade Negotiations, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Chinese Taipei <p><i>The fourth session will deal with more detailed legal and logistical issues that the APEC Economies will encounter in the case of mega-FTAs. By way of example, it is reported that the TPP is scheduled to adopt a unique Rules of Origin rules. As such, the speakers and discussants will discuss key issues and traits associated with mega-FTAs, such as the TPP.</i></p> <p>Designated Discussants: Ms. Margaret Liang, Singaporean Foreign Ministry; Prof. Dukgeun Ahn, Seoul National University</p> <p>General Discussions (Questions & Answers by Participants)</p>
5.00 pm – 5.05 pm	<p>Wrap- up and Overview of Day 2</p> <p>Prof. Jaemin Lee, School of Law, Seoul National University</p>
DAY 2 (SEPT. 23)	Wednesday
8.30 am– 9.00 am	Arrival/Registration/Coffee
9:00 am – 9:05 am	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Prof. Jaemin Lee, School of Law, Seoul National University</p>

<p>Session 5</p> <p>9.05 am – 10.40 am</p>	<p>An Overview of the Trade Facilitation Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. Deok-Young Park, School of Law, Yonsei University - Mr. Kichang Chung, Attorney, Yoon & Yang, Seoul Korea <p><i>The fifth session will explore yet another new issue of the global trading regime – trade facilitation. The speaker will discuss and explain the key contents of the Trade Facilitation Agreement of 2014 and its implication for APEC Economies. Focus will be placed on understanding the new sets of obligations imposed on APEC Economies as a result of the introduction of the new agreement.</i></p> <p>Designated Discussants: Mr. Jawyang Huang, Office of Trade Negotiations, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Chinese Taipei; Prof. Asif Qureshi, School of Law, Korea University.</p> <p>General Discussions (Questions & Answers by Participants)</p>
<p>10.40 am – 11.00 am</p>	<p>Coffee Break</p>
<p>Session 6</p> <p>11.00 am – 12.30 pm</p>	<p>Logistical Challenges and Capacity Building for Developing Economies of APEC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ms. Eleanor Thornton, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) - Prof. Asif Qureshi, School of Law, Korea University (<i>The FTA Paradigm for the Configuration of World Trade and Foreign Investment: The Case of Outward Processing Zones</i>) - Ms. Joohyoung Lee, Attorney, Kim & Chang, Seoul, Korea <p><i>The sixth session will discuss logistical challenges that the developing economies will encounter as a result of the advent of the Trade Facilitation Agreement. The presentation by speakers will address the capacity building issues and areas of immediate support for developing states. The speakers will also touch upon APEC's capacity building efforts for trade facilitation.</i></p> <p>Designated Discussants: Mr. Chul-Hun Lee, Deputy Head, WCO Regional Intelligence Liaison Office for Asia and the Pacific; Mr. Kichang Chung, Attorney, Yoon & Yang, Seoul, Korea</p> <p>General Discussions (Questions & Answers by Participants)</p>
<p>12:30 pm – 2:00 pm</p>	<p>Luncheon</p>

<p>Session 7</p> <p>2.00 pm – 3.00 pm</p>	<p>Looking Forward – Trade Facilitation Agreement and the Future of the Global Trading Regime</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. Jaemin Lee, School of Law, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea - Dr. Hyo-Young Lee, Associate Research Fellow, Multilateral Trade Department of the Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP) <p><i>The seventh and final session will discuss the systemic implication that the Trade Facilitation Agreement will carry. This agreement has been understood to be one of the significant achievements in the DDA negotiations, so the successful conclusion and implementation of the agreement will signify that the global community can still deliver the negotiations of multilateral trading regime. The final session will also discuss the implication of Trade Facilitation Agreement for FTAs and vice versa.</i></p> <p>Designated Discussants:; Professor Heng Wang, Visiting Professorial Fellow, University of New South Wales; Mr. Stefano Inama, Chief of Division of Africa and Least Developed Countries;</p> <p>General Discussions (Question & Answers by Participants)</p>
<p>3.00 pm – 3.30 pm</p>	<p>Coffee Break/Wrap up and Evaluations</p>
<p>DAY 3 (SEPT. 24)</p>	
<p>9.00 am – 12:30 pm</p>	<p>On-site Visit to the Incheon Main Customs</p>
<p>13:00 pm – 3:00 pm</p>	<p>Luncheon</p>

PART II. Outputs and Results

2.1 Participants

■ APEC members

The program received very positive response and most of the APEC members were willing to participate. At the end, 31 participants from 15 APEC countries came to participate in the program. Participants actively made questions and involved in discussions. The participants are listed in the table below.

	Country	Participants	Position	Affiliation
1	Vietnam	Ms. Bui Thai Ha	Official	Ministry of Industry and Trade
2	Vietnam	Mr. Bui Hong Duong	Director	Ministry of Industry and Trade
3	China	Mr. Yinglei Gao	Third Secretary	Ministry of Commerce
4	China	Mr. Tang Liu	Deputy Division Director	General Administration of Customs
5	Malaysia	Mr. ADLI AMIRUL HISYAM MOHD YUSOF	Assistant Secretary	Ministry of International Trade & Industry
6	Malaysia	Ms. Wan Saadah Mohamed Muhibbuddin	Senior Assistant Director of Customs	Ministry of Finance
7	Russia	Ms. Ekaterina Chistiakova	Consultant	Ministry of Economic Development
8	Peru	Ms. Jennifer Olortegui Marky	Rules of Origin Coordinator	Foreign Trade and Tourism
9	Peru	Mr. Jorge Betancourt	Official	Foreign Trade and Tourism
10	Philippines	Ms. Jena Carmela R. Zulueta	Trade and Industry Development Analyst	Department of Trade and Industry
11	Philippines	Ms. Esperanza Jesusa Palomata	OIC Chief	Tariff Commission
12	Indonesia	Mr. Sri Bimo Adhi Yudhono	Trade Analyst for Directorate of Export and Import Facilitation	Ministry of Trade of Indonesia
13	Indonesia	Mr. Satrio Nugroho	Trade Analyst	Ministry of Trade

14	Thailand	Ms. Lawan Maythiyanon	Chief of Rules of Origin Sub-Division 1	Ministry of Finance
15	Thailand	Ms. Siriporn U-Lao	Customs Technical Officer Practitioner Level	Ministry of Finance
16	Mexico	Ms. Margarita Pastrana Jiménez	Department of Rules of Origin and Customs Procedures	Economy
17	Mexico	Ms. Berenice Colin García	Department of Rules of Origin and Customs Procedures	Economy
18	Brunei	Mr. Yusri Yahya	Diplomatic Officer	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
19	Singapore	Ms. Sarah Soon	Assistant Director	Ministry of Trade & Industry
20	Singapore	Mr. Tay Lide	Senior Assistant Director	Ministry of Trade & Industry
21	Japan	Mr. Katoro Matsuzawa	Deputy Director	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
22	Korea	Ms. Sungyo Choi	First Secretary	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
23	Korea	Ms. Eun Jung Choi	Second Secretary	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
24	Hong Kong, China	Ms. CHOY Mun See, Alice	Deputy Principal Govt Counsel	Department of Justice
25	Hong Kong, China	Ms. KWONG Hiu Tung, Katie	Govt Counsel (Treaties&Law)	Department of Justice
26	Hong Kong, China	Mr. NG Ka Lok, Eric	Assistant Trade Officer	Trade and Industry Department
27	USA	Ms. Juliana Kim	Head of Trade Unit and First Secretary	Economic Section US Embassy
28	Chinese Taipei	Cheng-Chih Li (Mr.)	Auditor	Ministry of Finance
29	Chinese Taipei	Heng Zhen Tsai (Ms.)	Clerk	Ministry of Economic Affairs
30	Chinese Taipei	Shao-Ching Jenny Van (M)	Senior Legal Advisor	Ministry of Economic Affairs
31	Chinese Taipei	Chian-Yi You	Special Assistant	Ministry of Economic Affairs

■ Other participants

Besides major participants from the APEC countries, the presentations and relevant discussions in the program were of a great interest for experts and scholars from the domestic academic fields of trade law, rules of origin and trade facilitation issues. Therefore, a dozen of professors, doctors, and students from Korea's major Universities including Seoul National University, Korea University, Yonsei University and so on also participated in the seminar.

2.2 Summary of sessions

■ Session 1

In the first session, the Chief for the Division of Africa, Least Developed Countries and Specials Programs of the UNCTAD, Mr. Stefano Inama, made a presentation on understanding the complexities and challenges of Rules of Origin in the FTA era. Firstly, he made an introduction on the trends in drafting ROO in FTA's. In mentioning the utilization rates in ROOs he numbered several lessons learned such as ROO matching industrial capacity are trade creating and generate value chains, ROO may be stringent and predictable leading to high utilization rates in NAFTA and ROO are not predictable and/or do not reflect industrial capacity.

He continued to explain the lessons in drafting and administering ROO deepening on using an input-output matrix to draft product specific rules of origin in FTAs and assess trade diversion. The methodology on doing this is based on a twofold approach: 1) Text-based comparative analysis of the recent ROO regimes to identify previous ROO that may affect parties of the mega regional; 2) An input-output matrix approach to match trade flows of imported inputs used in a party to a FTA to manufacture a finished products for export to the other party. As a figurative example he gave a brief explanation on China-ASEAN PSROs (2007) mentioning that the sub-heading 847330 of the Harmonized System classifying parts and accessories of computers was one the most imported and most exported item among ASEAN countries and China.

Finally, he made an examination on TTIP of input-output for Chapter 87 for Swiss car manufacturers concluding that the US-Korea PSRO for this subheading is by far more liberal. By allowing a CTSH it is possible to assemble parts classified in other subheading of heading 8708 into parts classified in this subheading. In simple words, all Swiss parts of cars imported into the EU can be assembled into parts and acquire originating status for exports to the US under TTIP.

Discussion and Q&As

In the following discussion and Q&A session, the discussant mentioned that the benefits of the FTAs can be easily evaporated if the ROO rules are not applied in a predictable manner because quite a few products can be found outside the coverage of particular FTAs through the application of complex ROOs. The burden is particularly significant for developing states as they do not have sufficient infrastructure and human resources. So, statements have been made that ROOs are the key elements of any FTA.

At the same time, observations have also been made that ROO is an issue of customs regulation enforcement. Whether an exporter or importer abides by the ROO and how the importing countries' customs enforcement agency enforce their laws and regulations, on the one hand, and how developing states face logistical difficulties in this respect, on the other hand, are two different things. According to them, the difficulty of abiding by the rules in and of itself should not provide an excuse of non-observance of the rules by the interested parties simply because exporters or manufacturers are from developing states. So, they argue that complying with the ROOs is an important task for all APEC Economies whether developed or developing ones and there should not be two different sets of rules or understanding that two different sets of rules can be accommodated. The rules should be the same and the focus should only be directed how to help developing states implement the rules domestically and manufacturers from developing states abide by these rules.

Mr. Stefano Inama provided comments based on his experience with UNCTAD. He stated that ROOs have always been an important issue for all the countries and that developing states have had difficulty in keeping up with the new trend of ROOs in the FTAs. He shared with the audience how effective UNCTAD education sessions for the officials of the developing states have been. He underscored the importance of continuous education programs for the officials of developing states. He also provided quantitative analyses of various ROO system of different FTAs to see which format is the most trade friendly or trade-supportive. Through this quantitative analysis, he mentioned that the best formula for each state and each FTA can be ascertained. In this respect, this analysis can also lead to the finding of the best formula for developing states as well.

■ Session 2

In Session 2, the presentation and discussion focused on key provisions and characteristics of the Rules of Origin in WTO and FTAs informing to the participants of how the mechanism would actually work in practice. The speakers reviewed key characteristics of the Rules of Origin both in the WTO and FTA regimes.

Ms. Margaret Liang, Singaporean Foreign Ministry

In general, she explained the key provisions and characteristics of ROO in WTO and FTAs, the principles and methods used at the preferential ROO and what it means to business in ROOs issues. Firstly, she defined what ROO is under the WTO agreement and explained that they are divided into: 1) MFN rules of origin which applies to MFN trade among WTO members and 2) preferential rules of origin which applies to trade between FTA partners.

After explaining the mechanisms on the application of preferential rules of origin in FTAs, she referred that procedure to qualify as a product that can claim preferences under FTA, must file a meticulous paperwork which differs from each FTA. If the ROO are too complicated, firms will not use the FTA, thus, the ROO gets into a business situation. This means: 1) the spaghetti bowl of complex rules that vary between FTAs often make it difficult for firms to comply 2) what are the advantages/disadvantages faced by firms under the different rules for “substantial transformation” such as the CTC rule, VA rule and process rule 3) so, for firms to take advantage of the benefits in an FTA, providing a flexible approach to proving originating goods status is key for effective market access.

Finally, she made a summary on how to determine if a good can claim preferential treatment under FTA concluding that if a good is entitled to preferential treatment, is necessary to check what is the MFN rate and the preferential tariff concession to calculate tariff savings.

Professor Henry Gao, Singapore Management University

After a general overview about the types of ROOs (product-specific and regime-wide ROOs) he reviewed substantial transformation as known, change in tariff classification (CTC), regional value content (RVC) and technical requirement (TECH) taking as examples the Korea-Singapore FTA (KSFTA), ASEAN Trade in Goods Agreement (ATIGA) and the Japan-Singapore Economic Partnership Agreement (JSEPA). Then, he mentioned the ROO rules can cause trade-diversion if they are too strict and that's why special rules are also included in the ROO regimes to encourage trade-creation. So, *de minimus* rules are necessary to encourage using non-originating materials from non-parties as the cumulation rules encourages the use of non-originating materials from other FTA parties. He also mentioned that, as one of the problems in FTA ROO regimes is in theory, is designed to discourage imports from non-members and encourage imports from members. However in practice, this can be abused for protectionist purposes.

As concluding remarks he brought up some thoughts as that ROOs will be more chaotic in the future –because of the TPP, TTIP, etc.-, this, is necessary to develop best-practices on ROO –preferably business-model oriented: global value chains & regional production networks- and develop multilateral disciplines.

Comments and Q&As

The Second Session generated more active discussions on the ROO and actual dispute settlement proceedings. Participants raised questions as to how ROO issues are claimed and presented at WTO/FTA dispute settlement proceedings and whether these disputes are any way different from other trade disputes. Questions were also raised as to whether ROO disputes are expected to increase over the next several years. They also asked what government officials should do to reduce the possibility of disputes in the ROO area in the future.

The presenters responded that the ROO disputes are treated the same way in the dispute settlement proceedings in principle. They, however, added that the logistical complexities of ROOs make these disputes different from other trade disputes: while other disputes can be

resolved through the interpretation of the texts of the agreement at issue, the ROO disputes require examinations of respective laws and regulations of individual states and elaboration of specific products at issue on an individual basis. Furthermore, the ROOs only provide basic principles for states and the states are supposed to elaborate their own rules based on these principles. So, these characteristics make ROO disputes distinguishable from other trade disputes. They also pointed out as such any ROO dispute require active participation and advice from ROO experts who are not necessarily legal experts.

Another aspect offered by the presenters was that the ROOs have been relatively simple in the WTO regime but that the trend is now changing fast because of the advent of the FTA regime. The situation has become more complex because of the surge of mega-FTAs and regional trade agreements. This change of trade regime also adds new layers of complexities to the ROOs. Furthermore, respective FTAs' ROOs also affect each other one way or another, both practically and legally. This mutual impact element makes the ROOs of today ever more complex than before. The developing states stand to feel the pressure disproportionately in this new landscape.

■ Session 3

In Session 3, presentations were focused on how the issue of Rules of Origin is addressed in the dispute settlement proceedings of the WTO and FTA. The discussions included unique traits that Rules of Origin disputes entail in the dispute settlement proceeding.

Professor Heng Wang, University of New South Wales

Professor Wang mentioned that a limited number of ROO disputes raised under WTO/FTA dispute settlement mechanism. In the late 1980s, there was an increase in the number of origin disputes arising out of quota arrangement and the “voluntary” steel export restraints. After the establishment of the WTO, there was a trade dispute initiated by the EC against the measures of US on rules and marks of origin concerning textile products. He introduced to the participants the *US-Textile Rules of Origin* (2003) case as the only dispute

before the WTO panel that deals with ROOs –7 cases cited ROO Agreement in consultation request- and then explained Canada-US FTA, NAFTA, US-Israel FTA etc. as examples of ROOs in FTA dispute settlement mechanisms.

He emphasized that the expected ROO disputes in the FTA era are those disputes that were arising out of ROOs but, may constitute trade barriers consequently. Thus, preferential ROOs restricting intra-FTA trade may constitute other restrictive regulations of commerce, for instance if they are technically and administratively complicated than necessary or if they require an excessively high level of processing in exporting country. Finally, he concluded that those disputes caused by complex or overlapping preferential ROO are likely to be addressed by consultation or domestic proceedings rather than panel adjudication of FTA.

Ms. Mette Werdelin Azzam, World Custom Organization (WCO)

She introduced the WCO saying that it is an organization with global reach, responsible for processing more than 98% of international trade which deals every cases related to customs and those engaged with ROOs. Then, she explained in a panoramic way the evolution of customs role, the legal framework between the MFN provision and the preferential trade, the increasing number of preferential agreements which makes, consequently, a spaghetti bowl of complex because of overlapping ROO legislations –both preferential and non-preferential-. To mend this situation, she said that the WCO made a comparative study on ROOs and still the following studies are currently available: comparative study on certification of origin, origin irregularity typology study, world trends in preferential origin certification and verification, etc.

She gave a detailed account on dispute settlement mechanisms highlighting that since WTO Agreement on ROO are not harmonized, national legislations and those provisions agreed between contracting parties (said FTA) prevails on dispute proceedings.

As future expected disputes she jumped to conclusions that can be increasing importance given by many countries to origin marking and anti-dumpling disputes linked to non-preferential ROOs. Thus, concrete development on ROO regulations looks urgent to made

but, WTO members are reluctant to harmonize ROOs because of dumping practices which links to trade and consumer production.

Comments and Q&As

Participants asked the speakers what would be a possible solution to the ROO complexities and resulting disputes. They also asked whether ROOs will take up a major portion of disputes in the FTA dispute settlement proceedings. Questions were also raised as to the role of the WCO in this respect. They particularly wondered whether WCO and WTO should cooperate and whether respective FTAs should consult with WCOs as well.

Speakers responded that the challenges being raised regarding ROOs are largely structural in nature, reflecting the fragmentation of the international trading regime. As the regime itself becomes further fragmented as a result of the surge of various FTAs, the ROOs that determine which product should be eligible to claim the benefit of which FTA also becomes equally fragmented. So, in their view, it was not necessarily appropriate to blame ROOs themselves for the difficulty and complexities. Rather, it is the system itself that should be found to be responsible. In this respect, the multilateralism does have the strength when it comes to the uniform and consistent application of the rules, including ROOs. In that respect, they proposed that states should be advised to consider re-vitalizing multilateralism in the long run.

In any event, the speakers observed that in the near term disputes of ROOs will continue to take a central stage in the dispute settlement proceedings of the FTAs. It is true that FTA dispute settlement proceedings are not actively mobilized at the moment, but it may change as more FTAs fine-tune dispute settlement proceedings with more specification. If so, ROO issues will find themselves ending up in FTA dispute settlement proceedings.

WCO plays an important role in this respect. It has played core role in the development of ROOs in the WTO regime and continues to coordinate its work with the WTO. When it comes to FTAs, such close coordination is relatively scant as FTA negotiations are largely done by two states in a confidential basis. But when there is a structural problem that raises a

general problem of many FTAs, the WCO may consider this problem and offer its own idea and proposal to solve it. Close cooperation between FTA parties and the WCO is also expected and should be encouraged as these rules become more and more complex.

■ Session 4

In Session 4, participants discussed the key issues and traits associated with mega-FTAs such as the Trans Pacific Partnership (hereinafter ‘TPP’).

Professor Yuka Fukunaga, Waseda University

First of all, she introduced the outlines of ROO in the TPP saying that the TPP countries agreed to seek a common set of ROO to determine whether a product originates in the TPP region. Also, agreed to this rules to be objective, transparent and predictable and are discussing approaches regarding the ability to cumulate or use materials from within the free trade area in order to make a claim that a product is originating. However, this outlines are mere general principles, consequently, there is necessary a substantial transformation such as change in Tariff Classification (CTC), Value Added Content (VC) and Specific Production Processes as technical requirements.

Based on WCO publications, she explained types of cumulation –bilateral, diagonal and full- emphasizing that TPP countries will adopt the diagonal cumulation since this is the most adequate to FTAs in more than 3 members. After mentioning some examples –such as the US-Japan FTA, NAFTA, ASEAN case, etc.- she worried that the worst-case scenario is not the ‘spaghetti bowl effects’ –where producers and exporters are faced on complicated choices but gets benefits from the FTA- than ‘no options’ to choose, since the regulations are so difficult to understand, countries will not use any. So, the best-case scenario is the harmonization of the ROO. This harmonization procedure can be made in format or in a specific product to take as examples. Either choices taken, the transparency will uniform ROO information management.

Mr. Jawyang Huang, Ministry of Economic Affairs of Chinese Taipei

He first made an overall observation and suggestions on preferential ROO in FTAs. After explaining the WTO disciplines and common preferential ROO provisions in FTA, he pointed possible legal tools and joint actions under APEC and the FTA institutions.

Particularly, he highlighted that all preferential rules are promoted to be simple (not complex), loose (not restrictive), business –especially to small and medium enterprises-friendly, multi-lateralized (not more “spaghetti bowl”), harmonized among others characteristics. Lastly, since the TPP is “coming to town” he questioned on how the ROO has to be approached and raised the possibility to be “NAFTA like”.

Comments and Q&As

The discussion in this session was centered on the impacts of TPP on its members and non-members as this is a new type of FTA. Since the general principle is regional cumulation among 12 members in a line by line basis, ROO in the TPP basically provides business flexibility to choose from the 3 choices mentioned earlier. To TPP members, this choice will bring enough flexibility to increase their trade amount, and for non-TPP members even though it is possible to argue that it will negatively affect them since multinational investors will invest more in the TPP countries to take advantage of the agreement, they will also benefit from the increased trade in the region one way or another. But the benefit for non-members may not match the one for the member states, of course.

Likewise, the TPP raises unique problems related to ROO systems as well. TPP’s case is more global than NAFTA which is the trilateral FTA among three closely related countries and causes an economic impact on the investment aspect as well: that is, trade diversion. It is not clear how this new impact can be handled in the new trade environment. First, attention should be directed at the investment area, and followed by recognition of multilateral relation vis-à-vis bilateral relation, and finally followed by focus on implementation costs over the

long run.

The TPP offers a good example how new types of FTAs can develop and transform the existing ROOs for better or worse. As new types of FTAs are adopted, new consequences and implications are raised from the ROOs which may not be necessarily similar to those we are already aware of under the existing FTA regime. While the contracting parties of the new FTAs such as TPP are very much hopeful that the ROOs in the new agreements bring an unprecedented benefit to them, but it is not entirely clear whether and how the new ROOs can be compatible with the existing ROO framework or not. If the existing ROO rules are not necessarily compatible with the new rules of mega-FTAs such as TPP, then tension is going to arise as to the possible violation of ROO rules either as a member of the WTO or as a party to other FTAs. At the same time, the new FTAs do show that the ROOs can be a pivotal tool to increase trade volume and eliminate trade barrier among member states of trade agreements.

Speakers also underscored that their countries' active participation in the TPP is closely related to the beneficial rules of origin of the TPP. The benefit will bring them in a better position in the competition of the global market. The new rules are also conducive to the increasing trend of the Global Value Chain concept as well.

■ Session 5

In session 5, another issue of the global trading regime was debated: the Trade Facilitation Agreement (hereinafter 'TFA'). The speaker discussed and explained the key contents of the TFA of 2014 and its implication for APEC economies. The session was focused on understanding the new sets of obligations imposed on APEC economies as a result of the introduction of the new agreement.

Professor Deok-Young Park, School of Law, Yonsei University

Professor Park centered his presentation on explaining the Trade Facilitation Agreement.

He started making an overview of the agreement, then, after introducing briefly the history and the contents of the TFA he reviewed the economic impact and the implications for APEC Economies. He highlighted the good governance of the trading market as the main purpose of the agreement. Consequently, APEC member economies need to smoothen the implementation of the TFA in order to reduce the cost of cross-border trading through simplification of trade regulations and require more experts in trade facilitation with knowledge of the FTA as well as WTO agreements in general for implementation of the TFA among other implications.

Mr. Kichang Chung, Yoon & Yang

In general, he made a brief introduction on what is trade facilitation and why it is needed in trade matters. He presented the TFA as the first multilateral agreement since Uruguay Round which includes provisions for expediting movement, release, and clearance of goods (including goods in transit). Also, the TFA includes provisions for technical assistance and capacity building.

He mentioned that the TFA will enter into force once 2/3 of 161 members of the WTO have completed their domestic ratification process –107 members has to ratify the TFA to be this hold on-. The TFA significance is to provide building capacitation program, emphasizing that the TFA is a meaningful regulation payable for DDA agenda which will proceed the WTO (since Uruguay Round) promoting the world trade order.

Comments and Q&As

While the benefit of the TFA has been extensively discussed, some participants asked how the benefit can be proven and quantified. If the benefits are merely abstract in form, some may challenge the wisdom of enforcing the TFA vigorously in the future. At the same time, questions were also raised as to how developing states can be supported by developed states. They pointed out that unless specific pledges are made to support the developing states for

the customs digitization and adoption of IT equipment, the new agreement would simply mean yet another source of cost for developing states.

Some participants also highlighted the political implication of customs regulation domestically. They mentioned that as much as customs regulation is a critical element of law enforcement function of domestic legal system, how the customs regulation system is structured and operated is closely related to the domestic political environment as well. This aspect of the issue also raises the possibility that other issues than merely economic benefit may sometimes come into play when it comes to the implementation of TFA. So, merely focusing on the economic benefit from the streamlining customs procedure may not portray the entire picture of the situation for many countries, particularly developing states. Also, the introduction of ethical codes to the regulation to customs officials in their actual operations should be discussed as well in order to promote opportunities to good practices. Unless this issues is fully addressed, any customs proceedings reform would be meaningless and disoriented.

The speakers responded that the benefit of the TFA can be quantified using the data and statistics which are largely reliable. There may be slight variations from country to country, but it has been proven that both developing and developed states are all supposed to enjoy benefit from the shortened customs clearance process. They also pointed out that the customs procedure has been identified as the most outstanding source of NTBs for many countries, so the digitization of the process would reduce the possibility of using customs procedures as a pretext or catalyst for NTBs in the future.

The speakers also agreed that a political dimension is always important regarding domestic laws and regulations regarding customs procedure. The customs issues are also closely related with the law enforcement function of many states, which are by nature political. The speakers added that in fact the political dimension is another reason why the adoption of IT is crucial: the introduction of new technologies may reduce the political consideration and thus political pressure on the government officials. As many areas of the economy are adopting IT and new electronic equipment, there is no reason the customs clearance proceedings do not follow suit.

■ Session 6

In Session 6, the logistical challenges that the developing economies will encounter as a result of the advent of the TFA was discussed. The speakers addressed the capacity building issues and areas of immediate support for developing states. Also, APEC's capacity building efforts for trade facilitation was treated.

Ms. Eleanor Thornton, US Agency International Development (USAID)

As International trade specialist, she introduced a capacity building plan to improve supply chain performance. She generally explained that APEC is very dynamic in implementing trade facilitation. Also, she mentioned that the APEC members are focusing on five programs which overlap with the TFA –Pre-arrival processing, expedited shipments, advance ruling, release of goods and electronic payments-. The “reality on the ground” is working on the reality of the custom regulations and these measures should be translated to actual time and gain interests from other economies.

Professor Asif Qureshi, School of Law, Korea University

His presentation was about the FTA Paradigm for the configuration of World Trade and Foreign investment, focused on the case of outward processing zones. He started by explaining whether international investment liberalization and its regulation should be conceived through the prisms of world trade within the context of the practice of FTAs. Then, he addressed the relationship between investment and trade liberalization, including the propriety of any cross-fertilization of the international disciplines in the two fields. Concretely, he emphasized the intersection of investment and trade mentioning that the origins of investment and trade are connected, this means, there are synergy between investment and trade as a positive relationship.

During his presentation he raised the following issues: 1) what the relative net advantage is

for trade and investment flows respectively, consequential upon the relationship between the two, in the one setting? 2) Is the benefit in the home country or the third one? 3) Nature and quality of the enhanced foreign trade and investment generated, etc.

As regards legal aspects of the relationship, he referred that this issue needs to be approached with caution, taking by reference the impact of trade related to the investment measure on the flow of international trade –for example TRIMS-. Further, he continued with his presentation explaining what outward processing zones are, saying that are exceptions to the territorial principle underpinning the preferential rules of origin.

Finally, he concluded his presentation by explaining the manner in which the phenomenon of Export Processing Zones qua investment regimes is configured from a legal perspective in FTAs.

Ms. Joohyoung Lee, Kim & Chang

She generally introduced the WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement by saying that this provides all the steps that can be taken to smooth and facilitate the flow of trade. She explained that WTO exists to simplify harmonize international trade. She continued saying that WTO TFA aims: 1) expedite movement, release and clearance of goods, 2) improve cooperation between customs and other authorities and to 3) enhance technical assistance and build capacity. She also made an exhaustive presentation regarding the objectives of Capacity Building highlighting that capacity building for developing countries is fundamental for the substantial and successful implementation of WTO Agreements.

Comments and Q&As

There have been discussions on specific issues of TFA. In particular, participants raised questions on how specifically capacity building can be achieved for developing states. In order to define capacity building in the TFA Section 2, the actual need of the developing states should be taken into consideration rather than how the giver countries understand what

the situations are in their views. In addition, any interpretation and implementation of the TFA should be based on the notion of special and differential treatment. Examples mentioned by the participants for the capacity buildings were AEO systems, or provision of IT technologies to the developing members, coordination with other international organizations including WCO, and single window system administration.

Comments were also provided that TFA is also touching upon TBT, and SPS measures as well to the extent that these measures are imposed during the customs clearance proceedings. As a matter of fact, many NTBs are related to the customs proceedings one way or another, so the trade facilitation issue can sometimes be broader than merely technical customs clearance issues. Many SPS and TBT issues can be raised as a possible deviation from the TFA or trade facilitation rules can be applied to achieve the goals of SPS and TBT in essence. This consideration underscores the unpredictable nature of the TFA in the future. It is straightforward regarding customs clearance rules but is not so clear regarding other trade issues being raised at the border. The trade facilitation is thus more complex than it actually seems and contains sources of further debates in the future.

Speakers responded that capacity building projects for developing states are far from easy and it takes a long time. Compared to hardware infrastructure, software infrastructure is difficult to develop as it also involves amendments of laws or regulations as well as general practice. It is particularly difficult to change the way people think and behave. Without the changed mindset, the true facilitation may still be elusive even with the modernized equipment. Thus, it is imperative that customs officials of all states possess the willingness to expedite and facilitate customs clearance process in a way customs process does not create another barrier for traders. Capacity building projects should not forget to address this aspect of trade facilitation issue.

■ Session 7

In Session 7, participants discussed the systemic implication that Trade Facilitation Agreement carries and the implication of Trade Facilitation Agreement for FTAs and vice

versa.

Professor Jaemin Lee, School of Law, Seoul National University

Professor Lee's presentation was focused on Trade Facilitation Agreement and the future of the global trading regime. His presentation was consisted of 3 sections. Firstly, he reviewed the significant achievements of the TFA emphasizing that the TFA is important not just in agreement itself, but also as a morale booster for the global trading regime.

Secondly, as remaining challenges of the TFA he mentioned that developing members still possess concern and that they face significant difficulties in climbing the IT ladder which makes the capacity building all the more critical. Here, the piecemeal support may not be able to address the fundamental problem. He mentioned, also, that increasing problems of NTBs which exist in many different forms in diverse areas show that they are hard to identify with the difficulty of accumulating evidence, etc. So, when applied to FTAs, looking at the texts of the agreement only would be too premature to expect how they are actually implemented at the end of the day. Thus, with respect to FTAs, conclusion of an FTA is just the beginning and full implementation by members is the key.

Finally, as implications and lessons, he highlighted that the TFA is an important morale booster and offers a good turning point for the global trading regime. At the same time, he also mentioned that there are drawbacks when viewed from a rule-making process. The agreement is limited in its scope: it only applies to customs clearance and does not touch upon a wide variety of border measures of various sorts that can also be raised during the customs procedure. So, as long as these related issues are not taken into account, merely adopting modernized equipment may not necessarily guarantee streamlined customs procedure all the time. This is the area where the APEC can provide its own contribution with its flexibility and openness as a non-binding discussion entity. The APEC can contribute to the development of the TFA and its implementation in the long run.

Dr. Hyo-Young Lee, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP)

She generally explained trade facilitation emphasizing its rising importance because of the growth of global value chains, recent gaining attention as means to improve ‘quality’ of trade (with reduced tariff levels) and –for developing countries- for enabling lower barriers to trade for enjoying the benefits of increased trade and becoming integrated into global production process.

She also reviewed the elements of trade facilitation: lack of adequate infrastructure, human resources, lack of cooperation and legislation which operates as problems faced by developing countries and the broad definition of trade facilitation.

After making a brief explanation on general features of TF provisions in FTA/RTAs –such as the lack of consistent terminology, aspects almost non-existent in early RTAs, etc.- she introduced to participants the key provisions and level of development of Korean FTA trade facilitation rules.

Comments and Q&As

Participants asked why TFA is a barometer for the future negotiations of DDA or any other multilateral negotiations. They inquired the conclusion of TFA is perhaps not a good indicator how the WTO members would react in other areas of trade negotiations because trade facilitation is one of the areas where almost all countries share the same views. Other questions also touched upon how trade facilitation issues will be taken up in regional FTAs. In particular, the question was whether FTAs would just follow TFA’s basic feature or they would develop their own rules of trade facilitation.

Speakers responded that the TFA itself may not be an important issue in the larger picture of the DDA negotiations. But the fact that the members were able to agree upon a particular pending issue itself is important and meaningful because states can agree upon other “low hanging fruits” when the negotiations resume and the settlement of these easy issues might provide a good excuse to wrap up the controversial DDA and move forward. Another reason that TFA should receive credit is because it successfully brokered the different views between developed states and developing states. As the confrontation between the two groups

represent the standstill and paralysis of negotiations in many sectors of the DDA, the successful compromise between the two camps in the TFA signals that the two sides have learned how to accommodate the desire and request from the other side. The experience thus gained can be efficiently utilized in other context of the negotiations as well.

At the same time, the TFA also presented a worrying picture as well. While the trade facilitation issue had been long regarded as the easiest issue among WTO members, the fierce debates among members forced the missing of the initial deadline in July 2014. It shows how difficult and controversial other issues might be when the negotiations in these fields are opened. The TFA also showed the influence China and India exercises, as the leaders of the developing states, in all the areas of negotiations.

The final score sheet of the TFA is not available at the moment. Once it comes into force and applied by member states, then new issues of practical and legal concern will be presented. We will also find out how countries implement the agreement domestically and how other countries respond to the implementation by key states. Most importantly, we will also find out soon how capacity building work is implemented by the WTO members and whether the developing states are largely satisfactory concerning the support they get from the developed members. Only then will we able to determine whether this agreement is to be called a success. For now, the fact that the WTO members were able to conclude one key agreement from scratch in and of itself deserves attention and applause. /END/

PART III. Evaluation and Feedbacks

The overall assessment on the APEC FTAAP Capacity Building Workshop was positive. Both the presenters and participants found that the Rules of Origin and Logistical Challenges of Trade Facilitation issues are very important and increasingly so in recent global economic environment. The presenters were experts on WTO/FTA matters, particularly on the ROOs and TFA regulations, and the appraisal on their contribution as well as their personal network was highly positive. In general, the APEC members responded positively to this workshop and showed strong interest in the subject matter and such forum for discussion. Besides a number of Korean participants from the government and academy, 31 participants from 15 APEC members' countries attended the Seminar, actively involving in discussions of the Program sessions and putting in much effort to steer the future direction of the APEC initiatives on ROO and TFA issues.

3.1. Survey Results

An on-spot survey was conducted at the end of the two-day seminar program with a view to gather feedbacks and suggestions for future work. The Total of 5 questions were asked and 28 participants (from 14 countries) submitted the answers, largely finding that the seminar was "satisfactory", the highest rank, or at least "good", the second highest, in terms of its overall format, content, presenters and hosting process.

The 5 questions surveyed are as in the following:

Q1. How would you evaluate the overall seminar? Any comments?

Q2. How well did the seminar meet its objective? Any comments?

Q3. How would you evaluate the appropriateness of the speakers, presenters, and audience?
Any comments?

Q4. How will the seminar benefit or change your work, organization, or economy? Or what changes do you plan to implement when you return to your home economy?

Q5. Any other comments of the seminar or the subsequent activities to be pursued in order to build on the results of the seminar

The aggregate results of the survey on question 1 through 3 are summarized in the following table:

	Q1 Assessment on the overall seminar	Q2 Assessment on the fulfillment of the objective	Q3 Overall satisfaction
“Satisfactory”	18	18	16
“Good”	10	10	11
“Fair”			1
“Not satisfactory”			
“Bad”			

□ Survey result of Q1- Assessment on the overall seminar

18 respondents assessed that the overall seminar was "satisfactory" while 10 respondents chose "good". Most of the respondents said that the seminar was well organized. They found that the topics were suitable, useful, interesting; speakers were excellent and knowledgeable; overall organization was dynamic; and the hosts were friendly. They also responded that the venue was good and well-equipped.

□ Survey result of Q2- Assessment on the fulfillment of the objective

18 respondents assessed that the overall seminar was "satisfactory", 10 respondents chose "good". Most of the participants said that the program was informative, comprehensive, balanced between its practicality and academic issues.

□ Survey result of Q3- Overall satisfaction

16 respondents assessed that the overall seminar was "satisfactory" while 11 respondents chose "good" and 1 answered with "fair".

Largely, they were satisfied with the seminar and speakers in particular. They were

satisfied because they could hear some agreed and some varied opinions of legal experts, professors, government officials and other experts; it was good to have speakers from different organizations such as WTO, APEC, universities. However, some commented that it could have more government officials (or from the public sector) as speakers.

□ **Survey result of Q4- Participants' benefit and subsequent plan**

The respondents said that they could broaden and deepen their understanding about the key contents of Rules of Origin, Trade Facilitation Agreement and its application in FTAs. Many of them mentioned that the valuable experience of the speakers will improve their daily work.

Also, the seminar made them to observe more about the real impact of the ROO negotiated on bilateral and regional trade.

□ **Survey result of Q5- Comments on the future activity**

Despite the generally positive response and satisfaction, the participants were asked to make suggestions about improvements in the future. They generally thought that the speakers were excellent but they suggested that future activities involve more government official experts for practical perspectives, experts for TF in FTAs, and/or key sector stakeholders for real experiences. Regarding the format, they suggested more interaction, more discussion and/or group activities. Some said that there need to be more exercise to better understand the topic whereas others said such exercises were unnecessary given the limited time and different backgrounds.

The participants were generally satisfied with the contents of the seminar. Nevertheless, some suggested that future activities since the overall proceeding was rather too fast for beginners would be useful having the materials before participating the seminar while others mentioned that the topics were too academic and could have been more time and opportunities focused on sharing participant's experiences and comments.

Last, some participants suggested circulate the draft report and give participants opportunity to provide more comments.